

# THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



## ADVISORY BOARD :

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. M. Ginsberg. Prof. C. Singer.  
Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

## EDITORIAL BOARD :

Rabbi A. Altmann, Ph.D. D. Diringer, D.Litt. A. M. Hyamson, O.B.E.  
M. Marmorstein, M.A. Rabbi I. I. Mattuck, D.H.L. C. Rabin, D.Phil.  
S. Stein, Ph.D.

## EDITOR :

J. L. TEICHER, M.A., Ph.D.

Vol. IV. No. 3

1953

## CONTENTS

	Page
J. L. TEICHER	
THE TEACHING OF THE PRE-PAULINE CHURCH IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS—V . . . . .	93
M. H. GOTTSTEIN	
STUDIES IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS . . . . .	104
ARIE RUBINSTEIN	
HEBRAISMS IN THE SLAVONIC "APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM" . . . . .	108
CECIL ROTH	
JEWISH PRINTERS OF NON-JEWISH BOOKS IN THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES . . . . .	116
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	
A. M. HONEYMAN: 1. NOTES ON A TEACHER AND A BOOK . . . . .	131
J. L. TEICHER: 2. DOCUMENTS OF THE BAR-KOCHBA PERIOD . . . . .	132
C. RABIN AND D. WINTON THOMAS	
CURRENT LITERATURE . . . . .	135

# THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

## CONTENTS

# THE TEACHING OF THE PRE-PAULINE CHURCH IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS—V

(Continued from Vol. IV, No. 2)

Among the religious movements or sects which developed within, or derived from, Judaism, the only one that adopted as the basic tenet of its faith the conception of history exhibited in the "Damascus Fragments" was Christianity. According to the "Fragments," the advent of "the True Teacher" opened the way of salvation from sin and deliverance from God's wrath. It is the fundamental belief of Christianity, and of Christianity alone, that the advent of Jesus signified deliverance from sin and the appeasement of God's wrath. The inescapable conclusion to be drawn from the perfect congruity between the Christian belief and that of the "Fragments" is that the latter are a Christian writing and that "the True Teacher" is Jesus.

This conclusion is confirmed by another striking congruity. According to the "Fragments" (p. 1, line 11), "God raised up for them [men] the True Teacher to guide their feet into the way of His mind." The mission of "the True Teacher" was thus to teach men the way of God. It is exactly in the same manner that in Mark xii, 14, Jesus, characteristically addressed as "Teacher we know that thou art true," is referred to: "Thou . . . teachest the way of God in truth."

The conclusion that *moreh ha-šedeq*, "the True Teacher" of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the "Damascus Fragments," is identical with Jesus, is of the utmost importance. It solves once and for all time the problem of the origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls. No effort should therefore be spared to establish beyond any doubt the correctness of this identification. I propose now to show in a detailed analysis of two homilies (the first and another) of the "Damascus Fragments" that the advent of "the True Teacher" is conceived as the realisation and fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations expressed in biblical passages, in a manner that is typical, and exclusively typical, of Christianity.

A small matter needs, however, to be cleared up first. It might legitimately be asked why—if it is true the author of the first homily in the "Fragments" regarded the past history of Israel up to the advent of "the True Teacher" as a single period of sin and God's wrath—he did not express his thought in a direct and straightforward manner. Why did he propound his idea of the pattern of history in such an indirect fashion, saying that the First Temple was destroyed because Israel had sinned and that Israel continued to sin after its destruction?

This difficulty is readily solved if we have clearly in mind the purpose of the first homily. Its author was not concerned to expound his idea of the pattern of history as such, but rather to use this pattern as a homiletical *leitmotif* in order to explain the meaning



and drive home the lesson of the tragic historical events, the memory of which was still alive among the members of his sect. These events were the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Titus in 70 C.E., in the course of which members of the Jerusalem Church perished.<sup>1</sup> This disaster is viewed by the author of the homily in the light of his conception of history. The members of the Jerusalem Church had, by following Paul, betrayed the teaching of the fathers who founded the community<sup>2</sup>; they had thus sinned again and had rekindled God's wrath and provoked the destruction of Jerusalem, just as Israel had done at the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The reference in the homily to the destruction of the First Temple is thus appropriate. The death of these traitors, who "spoke rebellion against the commandments of God [revealed] through Moses and His Holy Messiah,"<sup>3</sup> was the punishment inflicted on them by God "to requite the wicked."<sup>4</sup> It was an example of the punishment that the wicked will suffer on the Day of Judgment about which "the True Teacher" (Jesus) had taught.<sup>5</sup> The wicked are those who despise the divine commandments, and the lesson which the author of the homily draws from his interpretation of the disaster that befell the Christian community in Jerusalem is that his contemporaries should beware of abandoning the commandments of God. He gives this warning explicitly on p. 8 of the "Fragments." After referring once again to the destruction by the sword of "the backsliders" during "the first period of punishment,"<sup>6</sup> that is, during the destruction of Jerusalem, he continues: "Such will be the judgment on all those who enter into the covenant of God and do not steadfastly observe these [rules]; they will be punished by total destruction at the hand of Belial."<sup>7</sup>

(a) "THE TRUE TEACHER," THE FULFILMENT OF BIBLICAL PROPHECY

In order to show how the advent of "the True Teacher" was conceived in the "Damascus Fragments" as the realisation of the messianic hope and the fulfilment of the prophetic promises, it is necessary to ask first what is the detailed picture of history offered to us in the homilies of the "Fragments." The homily on the opening page of the "Fragments" merely indicates succinctly that until the advent of "the True Teacher" the people lived under the

<sup>1</sup> *Damascus Fragments*, pp. 1-2, ll. 12ff. See the interpretation of these passages in my paper, *The Damascus Fragments and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect*, in *JJS*, II (1951), pp. 122ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Fragments*, p. 1, l. 14. The followers of "the Man of Scoffing" [Paul] removed the boundary signs set up by the "ancients" (*hari'shonim* = the first ones).

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 5-6, ll. 21-1.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 7, ll. 9ff. See the translation of the context and its interpretation in my paper in *JJS*, III (1951), pp. 117ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 1, ll. 11-12. See my translation of the whole passage and the comment on it in *JJS*, IV (1953), No. 1, p. 50, n. 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 7-8, ll. 21-1: בקץ העקרה הראשון והנסוגים הסגורו לדור

<sup>7</sup> *Fragments*, p. 8, ll. 1-2: ימשש כל באי בריתו אשר לא יחזיקו באלה לפוקדם לכלה ביד בליעל. The expression *ba'eleh* refers to the "rules" previously mentioned in the *Fragments* on pp. 6-7.

dominion of sin. But the homily on pp. 2-3 contains a sketch of past history which is much more illuminating. This sketch begins with the fall of the angels<sup>1</sup> and ends with the destruction of the Second Temple.<sup>2</sup> It is a tale of almost unrelieved sin and divine punishment, in which Noah and the patriarchs are exceptional. The sin was "stubbornness of heart" (*sheriruth lebh*), and it is notable that this sin alone is mentioned. It led to the abandonment of God's commandments<sup>3</sup> and to conduct based on arbitrariness of will.<sup>4</sup> The "sons of God" and their progeny, the giants,<sup>5</sup> sinned in the stubbornness of their hearts and were punished; so did "all flesh" that came after them who also were punished by God's wrath.<sup>6</sup> Noah's sons (but, presumably, not Noah himself) again went astray through this sin, and only the three patriarchs, the friends of God, were free from it. Jacob's sons again acted in stubbornness of heart,<sup>7</sup> and their children, both in Egypt and in the desert, committed the same sin; God's wrath was kindled against them and all were punished.<sup>8</sup> Their descendants in the land of Israel sinned, too, and they, their kings, their nobles, and the country itself, were all destroyed by God's wrath.<sup>9</sup> Finally, "the ancients who entered into the covenant were smitten by God's wrath<sup>10</sup> and given over to the sword, because they had abandoned the divine covenant, had chosen to act according to their own will, and had let themselves to be enticed by the stubbornness of their hearts to do what pleased them."<sup>11</sup>

The source of inspiration of this pessimistic view of history (the persistent sin of "stubbornness of heart" and the consequent punishment by God's wrath) is clearly Ps. cvi. The history of Israel, from the sojourn in Egypt to the first destruction of Jerusalem, is described here as a succession of acts of sin against God, followed by punishment, until in the end "the wrath of the Lord was kindled against His people, and He abhorred His own inheritance; He gave them into the hands of the heathen and those who hated them ruled over them" (verses 40-41). The historical sketch contained in the homily of the "Damascus Fragments" has many points of contact with the historical survey in Ps. cvi, and the characteristic phraseology employed by the author of the homily declares his dependance on the psalmist. Thus, for example, in Ps. cvi, 25, we read: "But they murmured in their tents and hearkened not unto the voice of the Lord." This was expanded

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 2, ll. 17-18; reference to Gen. vi, 4.

<sup>2</sup> P. 3, ll. 10-12.

<sup>3</sup> P. 2, l. 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.*, l. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Cpr. Gen. vi, 4.

<sup>6</sup> P. 2, l. 20. The expression "all flesh" (Gen. vi, 12) clearly refers to the generation of the Deluge.

<sup>7</sup> P. 3, l. 4. Read נה instead of נח in the MS.

<sup>8</sup> P. 3, ll. 8-9.

<sup>9</sup> The reference to Nebuchadnezzar's conquest is explicit.

<sup>10</sup> The destruction of the ancient covenants by the sword could not have taken place at any other time than in 70 C.E., as I have explained in my paper in *JJS*, II (1951), pp. 122, 126ff, 141. The ancients (*hari'shonim*) are the members of the primitive Jerusalem Church.

<sup>11</sup> P. 3, ll. 10-12.



by the author of the homily in the following manner: "They did not hearken unto the voice of their creator, the law of their teacher and they murmured in their tents, and God's wrath was kindled against their congregation" (p. 3, lines 7-9). The expression "God's wrath"—the key-word in the homilies of the "Fragments"—as well as the expression "congregation," are also present in Ps. cvi in verses 40 and 18, respectively.

More significant than the correspondence of the phraseology in the "Fragments" and Ps. cvi is the identity of ideas and sentiments in both compositions. The psalmist describes in verses 43-45 the inner spring of Israel's history as follows:

Many times did He deliver them, but they rebelled by following their own counsel and were abased because of their sin;  
He saw their affliction and He heard their supplication;  
And He remembered His covenant in their favour and revoked His decree in accordance with His great mercy.

The root of Israel's sinfulness and rebellion was, according to the psalmist, the people's "following their own counsel." The same idea is stressed again and again in the homily of the "Fragments": "They acted according to their own will" (p. 2, lines 20-21; p. 3, line 11); "They did what pleased them" (p. 3, line 12). The author of the homily, but not the psalmist, defines the source of this immoral and sinful conduct, as we have observed, as "stubbornness of heart." His divergence on this point from the psalmist is, however, apparent, not real. The same expression had been used by Jeremiah (xiii, 10) to characterise the sinfulness of the people: "This evil people, which refuse to hear my words, which walk in the stubbornness of their heart." The author of Ps. cvi had this passage in his mind when he wrote that the rebellious people "hearkened not unto the voice of the Lord" (verse 25); and he paraphrased Jeremiah's "stubbornness of heart" with the words "following their own counsel." The author of the homily, who knew his Bible intimately, simply restored the original term used in the source on which the psalmist had drawn, and he at the same time paraphrased the psalmist's own expression as "they acted according to their will."

God's merciful interventions in the past to save the people were conditioned, according to the psalmist, by the people's contrition, repentance from sin, and their turning to God for help, at which God remembered His covenant with the forefathers. ("They . . . were abased because of their sin. He saw their affliction and heard their supplication. And He remembered His covenant . . . and revoked His decree.") In the first homily of the "Fragments," God's act of mercy in bringing salvation to the people and deliverance from His wrath by raising up for them "the True Teacher" is likewise described as having been preceded by the people's contrition, repentance, and their turning to God, which

understood them ("And the people perceived that they were sinners and knew that they were guilty men. . . . Then God understood their actions—that they were seeking Him with a whole heart—and He raised up for them the True Teacher").<sup>1</sup> The connection of the "Fragments" with Ps. cvi is indubitable.

The exact nature of this connection, and this is the most important point, is no less certain. According to the "Fragments," salvation had come through "the True Teacher"; the psalmist, however, still awaits, and yearns for, salvation. He prays to God (verses 3-4):

Remember me, O Lord, with the favour Thou bearest unto Thy people. O deliver me with Thy salvation.

That I may see the good of Thy chosen, that I may rejoice in the gladness of Thy nation, that I may glory with Thy inheritance.

The salvation implored by the psalmist is messianic in character. His expressions "the good," "Thy chosen," "gladness" are almost identical with those that occur in the messianic passage of Is. lxxv, 13-15. The messianic stamp is also impressed clearly on the conclusion of the Psalm:

Save us, O Lord our God, and gather us from among the heathen, to give thanks unto Thy holy name, to triumph in Thy praise.

The gathering of the dispersion is the sign of the messianic age, and we must conclude that Ps. cvi is an impassioned prayer to God to usher in His salvation—the messianic deliverance. This is borne out, I submit, by the very phrase used by the psalmist: *poqdeni bishu'athekha* ("O deliver me with Thy salvation"). The stress here is on *Thy*, that is to say, the special messianic, divine salvation, which is on a different level from the acts of deliverance accomplished in the past through Moses and Pinchas (verses 23ff, 30ff). The final divine deliverance will be the gracious act of God alone as the deliverance from Egypt had been, when God saved the people "for His name's sake that He might make His mighty power to be known" (verse 8). The psalmist feels that he can address his prayer to God, because the preliminary condition for salvation has been fulfilled. The people, whose conscience he voices, have repented and are contrite, and the psalmist accordingly makes confession of sin, on his and their behalf, in the hallowed formula: "We have sinned with our fathers, we have committed iniquity, we have done wickedly" (verse 6).

The advent of "the True Teacher," through whom God brought salvation to the people, is, in fact, conceived by the author of the homily in the "Fragments" as the fulfilment of the psalmist's prayer. The expression used by him, "God brought salvation to them," is in itself clear evidence. The Hebrew term is *peqadam*

<sup>1</sup> P. 1, ll. 8-11. The *motif* of God's remembering the covenant occurs also in l. 4.



(p. 1, line 7), the past tense of the same verb which had been used by the psalmist in his invocation: *poqdeni bishu'athekha* ("O deliver me with Thy salvation"). In view of the close connection of the "Fragments" with Ps. cvi, the choice of this verb by the author of the homily was undoubtedly deliberate and purposeful.

Not only Ps. cvi, but other significant sections of the Bible also are joined to the "Fragments" by a subtle web of connections. The verb *pqd*, so charged with meaning, had been used by Joseph in reference to the future deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage (Gen. 1, 24, 25). The description of this deliverance, on rather of the preliminaries leading up to it, in Exod. ii, 23-25 shows that both Ps. cvi and the homily in the "Fragments" are closely linked with it. The text in Exodus reads:

And it came to pass in the process of time that the king of Egypt died. And the children of Israel sighed by reason of their bondage, and they cried. And their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage.

And God heard their groaning, and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob.

And God saw the children of Israel, and God knew.

The *motifs* in this passage recur both in Ps. cvi and in the homily: the *motif* of God's remembering His covenant with the forefathers, which has been referred to above, as well as the *motif* of the crying and groaning of the children of Israel and of God's understanding. In Ps. cvi, and likewise in the homily, the crying and groaning is interpreted as meaning repentance and contrition. The phrase in Ps. cvi, 44, "and He saw that they were afflicted," derives from the first half of the Exodus passage (ii, 25): "And God saw the children of Israel"; while the statement in the homily: "God understood their deeds" derives from its second half: "and God knew." The story of the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egypt, as described in Exodus, served for the psalmist as the paradigm of the messianic deliverance, and so it did also for the author of the homily, who made use in addition of the psalmist's utterance. But, while the psalmist was still hoping for, and expecting, the deliverance, the author of the homily saw it fulfilled and realised in "the True Teacher."

Finally, the description of the advent of "the True Teacher" in the homily reveals that this event was considered by the author as the fulfilment of the prophecies in Is. lvii, 16-19:

I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth because the spirit is prostrate<sup>1</sup> before Me as well as the souls which I have created.

<sup>1</sup> יִשְׁפֹּחַ. R.V. has "for the spirit should fail before me." The Rabbis, however, understood this verb to mean "to pray." Cpr. *Midr. Psalms*, 1022 (ed. BUBER): וְאֵין יִשְׁפֹּחַ אֵלֶּה חֲפֹלָה. This is borne out by Ps. lxxvii, 4. The meaning "prostrate in supplication" admirably suits the passage in Isaiah: "God will no longer be wroth, because the people turned towards Him" (Repentance from sin is implicit in their attitude).



For the sin of covetousness was I wroth and smote him. I hid me and was wroth, as he went frowardly in the way of his heart.

I have seen his ways, and I will heal him. I will lead him also, and restore comforts unto him and to his mourners.

I create the fruit of the lips; peace, peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and I will heal him.

Some phrases in this text indicate that the Exodus story of the deliverance from the Egyptian bondage was already regarded by the prophet as the paradigm of the future messianic deliverance. His expressions, "the spirit is prostrate before Me" (verse 16) and "I have seen His way" (verse 18), referring to the conditions immediately preceding the divine deliverance, repeat the *motifs* of Exodus: "And the children of Israel sighed . . . and they cried" and "God saw the children of Israel." The text of Isaiah links up with the Exodus story in the same manner as Ps. cvi and the first homily in the "Fragments."

This homily is moreover very closely connected with the text of Isaiah. The terms used by the prophet to describe the moral condition of the people and God's punishment before the act of divine deliverance are "sin" (*awon*), "God's wrath" (*qesef*), and "hiding" (*haster*). The same terms or their synonyms are employed by the author of the homily for an identical purpose: "God's wrath" (*haron*) and "because they sinned . . . God hid His face" (*ki bemo'alam . . . histir panaw*). Most illuminating is another link between the homily and Isaiah. The prophet describes the spring of the sinful conduct of the people in the following terms: "And he went on frowardly in the way of his heart" (*vayyelekh shobhabh bederekh libo*). The matrix of sinfulness, according to the homily, was "stubbornness of heart," wilfulness, which corresponds to the prophet's "the way of his heart." This expression throws light on the manner in which the homily describes the mission of "the True Teacher," Jesus: "God raised up for them the True Teacher to guide their feet in the way of His mind" (*lehadrikham bederekh libo*). The term "the way of God's mind," that is, "the way of God," was thus deliberately adopted by the author of the homily in full contrast and opposition to "the way of man's heart," the source of sinfulness in the Isaiah text.

In the primitive Church, the essence of the new faith was expressed in the formula "the way of God," as for example, in Mark xii, 14, and Acts xviii, 26. The same formula, although on a different theological level than in Mark and the Acts, was used in John xiv, 6: "Jesus saith unto him [Thomas], I am the way, and the truth, and the life." The text of the homily in the "Damascus Fragments" shows that this formula was derived, by contrast, from the text of Isaiah, just as the term, "the True

Teacher," for Jesus was also derived, by contrast and opposition, from Is. ix, 14.<sup>1</sup>

In his commentary on the Gospel of John, R. Bultmann contends that Jesus' declaration, "I am the way" (John xiv, 6), marks the point of separation between the mythological and cosmological conception on the one hand, represented by Gnosticism and Mandaism (which are concerned with the "innerweltlich Vorhandenes"—that is, the reality as apprehended by sense perception) in which "the way" and "the goal" are distinguished from each other, and the Christian conception on the other hand (which asserts the transcendental, eschatological "existence"), in which "the way" and "the goal" are identical with each other.<sup>2</sup> The general problem, whether Bultmann's interpretation of Christianity in terms of existentialism is valid, is not our concern here. But we must inquire whether it is correct to assume, as Bultmann does, that the term, "the way," is of Gnostic origin. It will suffice, without entering into discussion of the complex problem of Gnosticism and its relation to Christianity, to indicate that Bultmann's assumption, so indispensable for his entire interpretation of the Johannine Gospel, leads necessarily to a paradox, indeed, an absurdity. Jesus' declaration, "I am the way," is, according to John, the reply to Thomas' question in verse 5: "Lord we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?" Now, according to Bultmann, Jesus intended with his declaration to separate his teaching from mythological Gnosticism, the view represented by Thomas. Bultmann asserts this explicitly: "His [Thomas'] question characterises the mythological standpoint."<sup>3</sup> But is it not paradoxical, even absurd, to state that Thomas, the disciple of Jesus, was in fact a Gnostic? How could he be so and be Jesus' disciple at the same time? The biblical origin of the term, "the way," as shown above, frees us from all paradoxes and absurdities. What remains substantially true in Bultmann's interpretation is the contention that John's passages indicate the point of separation between one doctrine and another; not, however, between Gnosticism and Christianity, but between one Christian doctrine and another. This is an important problem, pertinent to the subject of this study, and it will be more convenient to deal with it in a wider context.

\* \* \*

The analysis of the homilies in the "Damascus Fragments" has shown that the text is woven, like a fine cloth, from significant biblical expressions, reproduced literally or in paraphrase, in synonyms or in contrast. The meaning of the text of the

<sup>1</sup> See my paper, *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites*, in *JJS*, II (1951), p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Göttingen, 1952, pp. 466ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Loc. cit.*, "Seine Frage charakterisiert den mythologischen Standpunkt."



"Fragments" cannot be properly understood until the associative links with the appropriate biblical passages are discovered. In this study of the text of two homilies of the "Fragments," only the main associative links have been considered, those connecting the text with passages of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ps. cvi. Many more such links with other biblical passages could have been indicated, but it has been found expedient to limit the analysis to those portions of the text of the homilies which have a direct bearing upon the historical conception of the "Fragments" and the figure of "the True Teacher." The analysis has shown that "the True Teacher" is conceived in the "Fragments" as the fulfilment and realisation of the messianic hopes and expectations expressed in the Bible. The demonstration that "the True Teacher" is identical with Jesus, which has been arrived at by various means of investigation, is now confirmed also by the results of the analysis of the literary form of the homilies in the "Fragments."

The literary form of the homilies—and this is another not insignificant result of the analysis—has been shown to be not peculiar to them. It had already been used in the Bible itself. The story of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, as told in Exodus, served as the paradigm of the future messianic deliverance both for the prophecies of Isaiah and the prayer of the psalmist. The literary expression of the messianic expectation in the prophet and the psalmist reveals an intimate connection with the phraseology used in the account of the deliverance of Egypt. The deliverance from Egypt was, however, no longer viewed by the prophet and the psalmist simply as a historical event, but as a religious experience which had revealed the relation of God, the merciful Saviour, to the repentant and contrite people. It is viewed in the same light by the author of the homilies in the "Fragments"; but for him the messianic hope was fulfilled in "the True Teacher." His literary form is in a certain sense a continuation of that of the prophet and the psalmist. He lacks, however, their pathos; his Hebrew is not spontaneous and the artificiality of his style, almost a mosaic of biblical phrases, betrays the insufficiency of his means of expression. What he says and the manner in which he says it are typically Christian. "The True Teacher" appeared as the effect of God's mercy to teach men the way of God and thus save them from sin and God's wrath. His advent represented the fulfilment of the biblical messianic expectation. This is asserted, as we have seen, by means of the subtle device of a literary form of expression, indirect, allusive, and suggestive, based upon the adroit use of significant biblical phraseology. Such a literary form could have been adopted only in a spiritual environment which was nurtured upon, and thoroughly acquainted with, the Bible.

This literary form was also used by the authors of the Gospels and other writings in the New Testament. It is different from,

though akin to, another literary form, also used in the Gospels as well as in the Habakkuk Scroll, which consists in relating significant historical or biographical events to definite biblical passages by presenting the former as the fulfilment and realisation of the latter. It seems as if the two literary forms were used for two different purposes, doctrinal and historical. The homilies of the "Damascus Fragments" inculcate doctrine by explaining the relevance and significance of certain historical events. Their literary form depends on the use of biblical phraseology to awaken the associative links with the Bible in the mind of the reader or listener and make him realise the solidarity of the new doctrine with the old one. I shall now quote an example from the Gospels which exhibits the same kind of literary form that we met with in the homilies of the "Fragments." In Luke i, 68-79, Zacharias celebrates Jesus in the following manner:

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel ; for he hath visited and redeemed his people

And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David ;

As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began ;

That we should be saved from our enemies and from the hand of all that hate us ;

To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant,

The oath which he sware to our father Abraham.

That he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear

In holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life.

And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest : for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways :

To give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins,

Through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day spring from on high has visited us,

To give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

There is nothing in common, from the æsthetic point of view, between this magnificent hymn and the pedantic prose of the homilies in the "Fragments." Both compositions share, nevertheless, the same form of literary expression. Zacharias' hymn is largely composed of biblical phrases or their synonyms in a manner that is strikingly similar to that of the homilies in the "Fragments." Two such phrases may be singled out here for special consideration. In verses 68 and 78, the R.V., from which I have quoted the hymn, renders the Greek verb *epeskepsato*—"visited." Moffatt translates the verb in verse 68 as "he has cared for," and in verse 78 (following a different reading in the MSS.) as "cause to visit."



In fact, the Greek verb corresponds to the Hebrew *pqd*, and is used by the LXX to render *poqdeni* in Ps. cvi, 4. The significance of this expression in the Psalm and in the "Fragments" has been discussed earlier; its meaning is "to bring salvation" and it ought so to be translated in Luke, too. It is, of course, not surprising that the same expression should have been used in reference to Jesus and "the True Teacher" in Luke and the "Fragments" respectively.

Another interesting parallelism between the homily of the "Fragments" and Zacharias' hymn is offered in verse 79: "To guide our feet into the way of peace." The first part of this phrase is identical with the phrase describing Jesus' mission in the "Fragments": "To guide their feet into the way of God's mind." It has been shown above that the expression "the way of God's mind" was derived, by contrast, from Is. lvii, 17. The expression in the Gospel, "the way of peace," derives directly from Is. lvii, 19. But there can be hardly any doubt that both the Gospel and the "Fragments" mean the same thing. This is proved by verse 77 of Zacharias' hymn, in which we have a statement concerning Jesus' mission, parallel to that of verse 79. Verse 77 reads: "To give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sin." The meaning of this verse coincides with that of the phrase in the "Fragments": "To guide their feet into the way of God's mind." The mission of "the True Teacher" is also to give men knowledge of the way of God and thus deliver them from sin.

It would thus appear that the exact expression used in this kind of literature (the New Testament, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the "Damascus Fragments") was to a certain degree a matter of indifference. It is not the single expression that mattered, but the whole biblical context from which it derives. The single expression—and this seems to be an important canon of interpretation—must be regarded merely as a pointer directing the mind to the relevant section of the Bible.

In dealing with Zacharias' hymn, I have assumed that it refers to Jesus. But scholars are very much divided on this point and some of them consider the hymn to refer to John the Baptist. This is an important problem, concerning very closely the subject of this study, and must be dealt with in greater detail.

*(To be continued)*

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

# STUDIES IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

## 1. THE INTERCHANGE OF FINAL YOD AND HE

It is by now a well-established fact that the orthography of the Dead Sea Scrolls reflects the pronunciation current at the time at which the Scrolls were written. Perhaps the best-known example of this is the interchange of the laryngals. In this study I intend to deal with another peculiarity: the representation of an *e*-sound at the end of a word by *yod* instead of *he*.

This phenomenon occurs in the following examples: Is. xxi, 9 *מעשה* for *מעשי*; xxxvi, 2 *שדי* for *שדה*<sup>2</sup>; xxxvii, 19 *מעשי* for *מעשה*; xxxviii, 1 *צוי* for *צוה*<sup>3</sup>; lx, 21 *מעשי* for *מעשה*; lxxv, 10 *לנוי* for *לנוה*.

If we assume the reading *ונכא* for *ונכח* in MT: Is. lxvi, 2<sup>5</sup>, we may add to the list *ונכאי* from DSIa. However, this assumption is not necessary, since *nikh'e* instead of *nekh'e* is paralleled, for example, by *yir'e* instead of MT *yer'e* (l. 10).

Examples from other scrolls are: DSD, I, 5: *בכול מעשי* for *מעשה*; DSW *עושי חיל* for *עושה*<sup>6</sup>; DSH xii, 4 *עושי* for *עושה*; xlii, 11 (on Hab. ii, 18) *ומרי* for *ומרה* (ומורה); DSF *מורי הצוק* for *מורה*.

The biblical quotations in the Dead Sea Scrolls represent—in as far as they are not corruptions—certain traditions in the history of the text. It might be worthwhile to examine the Massoretic text and the Samaritan Pentateuch for instances of the interchange of final *yod* and *he*. These instances fall into two classes. The first is contained in the following parallel passages: Gen. xlii, 32 *רעי צאן*—xlvi, 3 *רעה צאן*; Ex. xxviii, 26 *שתי*—Sam. *ישה*<sup>10</sup>; Deut. xxxviii, 60 *כל מדוה*—Sam. *ומדוי*<sup>11</sup>; 2 Reg. xxii, 5 *עשי המלאכה*—2 Chr. xxxiv, 10 *עשה המלאכה*<sup>12</sup>; 2 Reg. xxii, 17 *מעשה*—2 Chr. xxxiv, 25

<sup>1</sup> MT: *יען*. The use of the full forms of the *ל"י*-verbs instead of the short forms as in MT is well attested in DSS. I should like to make it clear that I do not regard the final *yod* in a form like *יעני* as a remnant of an original *ל"י* stem.

<sup>2</sup> But in lvi, 9 *שדה*, instead of MT *שדי*—vocalised *saday* (see also n. 1, p. 104).

<sup>3</sup> MT: *צוי*. Cf. note 1.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. LXX.

<sup>5</sup> A common, though superfluous, conjecture.

<sup>6</sup> *Megilloth Genuzoth II*, plate xi, 1-2. The reading, however, is not established beyond all doubts.

<sup>7</sup> But vii, 11 has correctly *עושי*.

<sup>8</sup> Fragment published in *R.B.* lix (1952), 414. The following *הוא* makes it improbable that a plural form was intended (*ib.* p. 415).

<sup>9</sup> This list does not deal with kindred cases where a final *e*-sound is represented by *י* for *א* (e.g., DSH x, 2); or *א* for *ה*, or *ה* for *א* (e.g., DSI v, 22 xl, 25; xlii, 5).

<sup>10</sup> See SPERBER, *Hebrew in Parallel Transmission*, in *HUCA*, xiv (1939), § 31. SPERBER listed (*ib.*, § 53) similar changes between MT and Sam. in Gen. vi, 14; xxii, 5; xxiv, 28; xxix, 34; xxix, 35; xxx, 31; Num. viii, 7; Deut. v, 9.

<sup>11</sup> The only other verse where this word occurs (Deut. vii, 15) has *מדוי*.

<sup>12</sup> *עשה* also in verse 13. There are other instances of the interchange of *עושי* in later books: Es. iii, 9; Neh. ii, 16; I Chr. xxiii, 24; II Chr. xxiv, 12 (differences between MSS!). Cf. EWALD,<sup>8</sup> p. 55; DELITZSCH, *Lese- und Schreibfehler*, p. 48.



מעשי; Is. lxiii, 11 רעה צאנו—MSS רעי; Mal. iii, 5 ומשי נר—'Ochlah we-'Ochlah, No. 116 ומטה; Ruth i, 6 שדה מואב—i, 22 ושדי; Eccl. xi, 9 ובמראי עיניך—MSS and Qere ובמראה. [It should be mentioned in passing that the interchange of *yod* and *he* is found also in manuscripts of the Mishnah, e.g., עשרה for עשרי (*esre*); שוה for שווי (*shawe*); הוה for הווי (*howe*); גיהמרה for המדלי; יכלה for יכלי.]

In nearly all the biblical cases that have been considered the interchange of final *yod* and *he* makes a singular noun look plural or vice versa. The second class of instances is formed by words in MT which are vocalised by a *hiriq* in accordance with the spelling *yod* at the end, while, in fact, the final *yod* stands for an *e*-sound. Thus, for example, in Is. xxxviii, 12 רעי is vocalised by the Massoretes as *ro'i*; it should be, however, *ro'e* (רעה = רעי); Jer. iii, 6 ותוני (*watizni*) is against the syntax; it should be *watizne* (ותונה = ותוני); Jer. xviii, 23 תמחי: Here God is apparently addressed in the feminine, and the Massoretes expressed their perplexity by the curious vocalisation *temḥi*. The correct form is, of course, *timḥe* (תמחה = תמחי).<sup>4</sup> Is. xxvi, 20 חבי should not be *ḥabhi* but *ḥabhe* (= חבה).<sup>5</sup> Deut. xxxii, 18 תשי is vocalised by the Massoretes as *teshi* after the fashion of תהי (*tehi*); it is, however, simply *tishshe* (תשה = תשי).<sup>6</sup>

The Scrolls help us thus to solve a number of *crucis* in the Massoretic text and to gain a deeper insight into it. But we must remember that they only present to us in a clearer light certain facts which are found also in the MT.

## 2. THE IMPERFECT PATTERNS

It is well known that already in biblical Hebrew the semantic differences between morphologically distinct patterns became blurred in some cases, as, for example, the *a/i/u*-perfects and imperfects, the *pō'el* and *pā'el* participles, etc.<sup>7</sup> This phenomenon

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Gen. xxxvi, 35; Prov. xxiii, 10; and DStA, lvi, 9, as against MT. BARTH called attention almost seventy years ago (*ZDMG*, xlii, 351) to the fact, that שרר stands in parallelism to a noun in the plural, whereas שר is parallel to a singular noun, e.g., Is. xxxii, 12 (but now שרי = שרה!). He remarked also (*Nominalbildung*, § 230) that the noun אשה (*ishe*) when it occurs in the construct state always becomes אשי. (But cf. the Sam. variant אשה in Deut. xviii, 1.)

<sup>2</sup> See I. N. EPSTEIN, *Mabho lenosah Hammishnah*, Jerusalem, 1948, p. 1251 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See E. PORATH, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, Jerusalem, 1938, p. 70. Even in later times a scribe might put *yod* instead of *he* in a moment of carelessness. Thus we find the spelling עשי רע (Mal. ii, 17) in the manuscript of IBN BAL'AM's commentary on Mal. iii, 15 (see *JQR*, N.S. xv, 52).

<sup>4</sup> This shows how careful one must be with text emendations and *ad hoc* phonetic laws (see the standard works on Hebrew grammar: GES. BERG., p. 160, n.; B-L, p. 423).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. also *Biblia Hebraica*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>6</sup> With some hesitation I mention the suggestion (DELITZSCH, *loc. cit.*) to emend מושבי (I Reg. xvii, 1) into מוּשְׁבָה (*mitishbe*).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. BÖTTCHER, *Lehrbuch*, § 912, 3; KÖNIG, *Lehrgebäude*, I, p. 173.

is even more pronounced in Mishnaic Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> It is hardly surprising that the DSS should provide us with further examples.

Driver has noted that MT *pā'el* becomes *pō'el* as in וְהַחֲזֹר (DSI lxvi, 2) and הַעֲשֹׂנִים (vii, 4).<sup>2</sup> More interesting and better attested is the development *yif'al* > *yif'ol*, which should be explained as due to Aramaic influence.<sup>3</sup> This preference for *yif'ol* forms is often linked up with the substitution of the *Qal*-stem for the derived stems: DSI יְדוּמוֹ (I, 18)<sup>4</sup>; יַחֲרוּב (xix, 5); יִשְׁבוּר (xxxviii, 13); יִכְשׁוּלוֹ (xl, 30); יְדוּמוֹ (xlii, 14); יִשְׁכּוּבוֹ (xliii, 17); אִשְׁבוּר (xlv, 2); תַּחֲפּוּרִי (liv, 4); וִיבְחֹר (lvi, 4); וְתִשְׁפּוּלִי (lvii, 9); מְקוּלוֹ (lxii, 10). DSD: יִשְׁפּוּלִי (ii, 23)<sup>5</sup>; יִשְׁכּוּב (vii, 10); יִבְדּוּלוֹ (ix, 5); אִכְשׁוּל (xi, 12). DSH: יִשְׁחֹקוּ (iv, 6).<sup>6</sup>

Yalon has recently assumed that the Scrolls exhibit yet another imperfect pattern: יִפּוּעַל.<sup>7</sup> If such a pattern should, in fact, exist, we could hardly speak of a tendency towards the establishment of one pattern only, as described above.

To my mind the cases adduced by Yalon cannot be taken as evidence of a יִפּוּעַל-pattern. The majority of these occur in פִּנּוּ verbs, e.g., תֹּאכַל, תֹּאמַר. In these forms, however, the two letters א ו express simply the sound *o*, as often happens in the Scrolls; for example: זֹאת, רֹאשׁ (also written alternatively רֹאשׁ, זֹאת). The remaining forms of this alleged pattern occur before object suffixes. Such instances are:

DSH: יִשְׁפּוּעַנִי (xii, 5). DSD: יִדְרֶשְׁהוּ (vi, 14); יִשְׁפּוּעַנִי (x, 13). DST<sup>8</sup>: אִדְרֶשְׁכָּה (ix, 2); וִישְׁמַעֲנִי (ix, 20). DSF<sup>9</sup>: יַעֲשֹׁקֵנוּ. DSI: יַעֲבוּרֵנָה (xxxv, 8) seems to be a further example.

It is too early yet to offer a definite explanation of this form. The two obvious possibilities are: transference (*Umsprungung*) or *anaptyxis*.<sup>10</sup> We do not know whether this form occurs only with particular consonants.<sup>11</sup> All that can be said for the moment is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ALBRECHT, *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, p. 103 and below note 3.

<sup>2</sup> *JThSt*, ii (1951), 23. שׁוֹן in Is. xxxiii, 24, is another example.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. e.g., DALMAN, *Grammatik*, pp. 266, 268, and now KUTSHER, *Tarbiz*, xxii (1951), 57. In Mishnaic texts with Babylonian vocalisation we find, for example, יִכְשׁוּר, יִכְשׁוּרִי, יִכְשׁוּרִי (PORATH, *loc. cit.*, pp. 38, 40). Cf. also GES.-BERG, II, 76.

<sup>4</sup> Instead of MT יִדְמוּ. Cf. my note in *Biblica*, xxxiv (1953), 214.

<sup>5</sup> The reading is not quite clear owing to the crease in the Scroll.

<sup>6</sup> The scribe might have intended to delete the first *waw*, but there is no need to assume that he thought of the form *yeshahu*, as suggested by YALON. *Kiryath Sefer*, xxvii (1951), 173. Cf. also the forms יִכְשׁוּל, יִכְשׁוּלִי, mentioned below.

<sup>7</sup> *Kiryath Sefer*, xxvi (1950), 241; cpr. also my preliminary note in *Leshonenu La'am*, xviii-xix (1951), 15.

<sup>8</sup> Published in *Megilloth Genuzoth II*.

<sup>9</sup> Published in *RB*, lvi (1949), 605, l. 9.

<sup>10</sup> The start would have been from a zero-vowel stage, e.g., *yidreshehu* > *yedorshehu*. The second possibility seems more probable to me.

<sup>11</sup> The instances with *'ayin* recall immediately the forms *ta'obhдем(?)* (Ex. xx, 5; xliii, 24; Deut. v, 9); *wena'obhдем(?)* (Deut. xiii, 3). The only other instances known to me are *te'okhlehu* (Job xx, 26, also mentioned by YALON, *loc. cit.*) and *hayhobhrekha* (Ps. xciv, 20). The problem of *yeshod(e)dem* (Jer. v, 6) is different.



that the alternating *pe'ol*/*po'l*-forms in the imperative (and infinitive) with object suffixes or cohortative endings<sup>1</sup> are now paralleled by alternating forms in the imperfect.<sup>2</sup>

We must distinguish therefore three different patterns of the imperfect with suffix: *yidreshehu*, *yedorshehu*, and *yidroshehu*—all of which are found in the DSS. The absence of reduction of the imperfect *o*-vowel before a suffix in the last pattern (a not uncommon phenomenon in the Scrolls) is parallel to the pseudo-pausal forms in the imperfect (*yidroshu*, etc.), which are also characteristic of the DSS. Such cases are:

DSI: ויסקוהו (v, 2); וילכוהו (xx, 1); תאכולנו (xxxix, 8)<sup>3</sup>; ויתפושם (xxxvi, 1)<sup>4</sup>; ויפרושהו (xxxvii, 14); אעזובם (xli, 17); יאכולם (l, 9); יואכולם (li, 8); יעבודוכי (lx, 12); יאכולוהי (lxii, 9).

DSD: ידרושהו (vi, 17); יפקודהו (vi, 21); יכתובהו (vi, 22); ויבדולוהו (vi, 25).

This pattern is not altogether new, for we find in MT *'ekhtobhenah* (Jer. xxxi, 33); *'eshtolenu* (Ez. xvii, 23); *yirdofekha* (Ez. xxxv, 6), etc.<sup>5</sup>; and *iezbuleni* (יזבלני) and *thezorēni* (תאורני) in transliterations.<sup>6</sup> In Mishnaic texts with Babylonian vocalisation we find *yikhtobhenu* and *yimkorem*.<sup>7</sup>

The Scrolls thus enlarge our knowledge of Hebrew morphology, and it might be worth while to investigate afresh the various theories about the influence of the stress on the development of the Hebrew imperfect forms.

M. H. GOTTSTEIN.

Jerusalem-London.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially the *Ketibh-Qere* problems of מלכה—מלוכה (Jud. ix, 8; cf. v, 12); צרפה—צרפה (Ps. xxvi, 2). Cf. also I Sam. xxviii, 8; Ps. xxxviii, 21; Is. xxxii, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also DST ix, 12 לרושכה. This infinitive *ledorshekha* is related to the ordinary *lidroshkha* in the same way as *yedorshekha* is related to the ordinary *yidroshkha*.

<sup>3</sup> The *yif'ol*-pattern should be noted.

<sup>4</sup> The infinitive להפושם (DSH iv, 7) follows this pattern. Here we get, so to speak, the counterpart of the form לרושכה.

<sup>5</sup> Some manuscripts exhibit variant readings with *shewa* instead of the *hataf*. Perhaps *tishmurem* (תשמורם) (Prov. xiv, 3) also belongs to this pattern.

<sup>6</sup> SPERBER, *loc. cit.*, p. 172.

<sup>7</sup> PORATH, *loc. cit.*, p. 39.

# HEBRAISMS IN THE SLAVONIC "APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM"

Ginzberg and Box, the only scholars, as far as we know, who have discussed the question of the original language of the "Apocalypse of Abraham,"<sup>1</sup> agree as regards the high probability that the "Apocalypse" was written in Aramaic or Hebrew. The indications suggesting an Aramaic or Hebrew original, underlying the Slavonic version and the no longer extant Greek version of which the Slavonic is a translation, noted by Ginzberg<sup>2</sup> and Box,<sup>3</sup> are as follows: the frequent use of the phrase "here I am" (Heb.: *hinnenî*), the use of the word "silver" for "money," common to Aramaic and Hebrew, and the sarcastic names "Merumath" and "Barisat," given to Terah's idols which presuppose a knowledge of Aramaic or Hebrew, or both, on the part of the original readers. Box is of the opinion that the simple co-ordination of sentences and the fact that Abraham figures as the speaker throughout, may lend some weight to the argument for a Hebrew original.<sup>4</sup>

An examination of the Slavonic texts S, A, and K suggests that a number of difficult or strange words and phrases in the "Apocalypse of Abraham" may best be explained by assuming that they reflect a Hebrew original. In view of the probable Palestinian origin of the "Apocalypse of Abraham"<sup>5</sup> it is a matter of special interest that several of the words and phrases alluded to bear a striking resemblance to linguistic usages peculiar to the "Manual of Discipline" and the "Thanksgiving Hymns" of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

<sup>1</sup> The following editions of the Slavonic text are referred to in the present study: S (from Codex Sylvester) and A published by N. TIKHONRAVOV in his *Pam'yatniki Otrechenoi Russkoi Literatury*, Moscow, 1863, vol. i, at pp. 32-53, and pp. 54-77, respectively, and K published by I. PORFIR'EV in his *Apokrificheskiya Skazaniya o vetkhozavetnykh litzakh i sobytiakh* in vol. 17 of the *Russian Academia Scientiarum Imperialis*, St. Petersburg, 1877, at pp. 111-130. The translations referred to are: the German translation by G. N. BONTWETSCH, *Die Apocalypse Abrahams in Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche*, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1897, and the English translation by J. I. LANDSMAN, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, edited by G. H. Box, *SPCK*, London, 1918. It must be borne in mind that all references to "Slavonic" mean Church-Slavonic of the Russian variety. The Slavonic version of the Old and New Testaments referred to is that of the great revised Church-Slavonic Bible, published in Moscow in 1762.

<sup>2</sup> *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. *Abraham*, p. 91b.

<sup>3</sup> *Introduction*, p. xv. Other possible indications of a minor character are hinted at *passim* in the footnotes.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> GINSBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 92b; Box, *Introduction*, p. xvi. Box thinks that the "Apocalypse of Abraham" may have emanated from Essene circles (*ibid.*, p. xxxi).

The examples discussed below are, it is realised, of varying cogency, and are offered with all due tentativeness. To take the more plausible examples first:

(a) CHAP. XIV (Box, p. 54)

The angel-guide informs Abraham that Azazel "*hath rebelled* against the Mighty One." Bonwetsch translates the phrase "*hath rebelled*" by "geratschlagt" (i.e., took counsel),<sup>1</sup> which agrees with the reflexive or reciprocal *suveshtavsha* in K and another MS.<sup>2</sup> A reads here *veshtavsha*<sup>3</sup> (i.e., spoke, declared). The English translation is obviously a paraphrase based on K A. Now the idiom employed by K is, clearly, Hebraic and is characterised by the use of the reflexive or reciprocal verb "to take counsel" followed by the preposition *on* in the sense of "*against*." It occurs in Ps. LXXXIII, 4, in the sense of "to conspire," "to scheme" or "design" against in the expression יתעצו על צפוניך and the phrase להיעץ על מצות אל, using what is in all probability the Niph'al in the same sense, actually occur in the "Damascus Fragm.," 3, 5-6.<sup>4</sup> It is indeed remarkable that the Slavonic agrees with the Hebrew idiom even to the extent of using the preposition *na* (= *on* = '*al*') in the sense of "*against*" after the verb "took counsel."<sup>5</sup>

(b) CHAP. XIV (Box, p. 55)

Abraham is warned by his angel-guide not to answer Azazel or remonstrate with him so that Azazel's will may not have free course in Abraham, because God has given Azazel "*weight and will*."<sup>6</sup> The Slavonic *tjagotu* (in the accusative) is unequivocal and is translated by Bonwetsch by "*Last*," ("*Gewicht*"), the former word receiving due parenthetical emphasis in his notes.<sup>7</sup> The editor of the English translation suggests that the text may be corrupt and remarks that the phrase might mean "an overpowering will."<sup>8</sup> Both scholars overlooked, however, the fact that the word occurs in the Church-Slavonic version of 1 *Thess.* II, 6,<sup>9</sup> where it may well mean something like "honour," "importance," "dignity"

<sup>1</sup> P. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Omitted by S; PORFIR'EV, p. 120, and TIKHONRAVOV, p. 64, note 2. It must be noted that the Slavonic texts are not divided into chapters or verses. The division into chapters owes its origin to BONWETSCH.

<sup>3</sup> TIKHONRAVOV, p. 64.

<sup>4</sup> SCHECHTER'S edition, Cambridge, 1910.

<sup>5</sup> Comp. also the Church-Slavonic translation of Is. xiv, 26, xix, 17; Je. xlix, 30, Na. 1, 11; Ps. lxxxiii, 4, where the Hebrew preposition '*al*' is translated by *na*. The Russian authorised version (Brit. and For. Bib. Soc., Vienna, 1914) retains the preposition *na* only in Je. xlix, 30.

<sup>6</sup> Omitted by S.

<sup>7</sup> P. 26 and note to line 9.

<sup>8</sup> P. 55, note 4.

<sup>9</sup> Also in 2 Co. iv, 17, where it is perhaps less clear.



(= *gravitas*),<sup>1</sup> or "worthiness"—all meanings duly noted by D'yachenko in his Church-Slavonic Dictionary.<sup>2</sup>

In DSD IX, 13, one reads: "These are the ordinances in which the wise man is to walk with every living being . . . and according to the weight (*lemishqal*) of every person." Brownlee<sup>3</sup> explains that the phrase, italicised here, means "according to the classification of each (whether priest, Levite, or Israelite) and also according to his respective rank within his own class." The verb from which the noun "weight" is derived occurs at DSD IX, 14, where the wise person is enjoined "to weigh" the Sons of Zadok according to their spirit (? = *ruhīm*). This suggests that the noun "weight" is employed in the immediately preceding passage in a rather less technical sense than that given to it by Brownlee and could be equated with "worth," "value" (*erekh*), "rank," etc. It may be possible, then, to interpret the word "weight" in our "Apocalypse" in the sense of "rank," "station," or "importance," thus suggesting that Azazel was given by God "official standing," so to speak, that his authority and function are legitimate and that he is not without "worth." This interpretation would accord with the underlying idea of the "Apocalypse of Abraham," which is, in the words of Box, "that God's heritage, the created world, is, under the condition of sin, 'shared' with Azazel."<sup>4</sup>

(c) CHAP. XXIX (Box, p. 82)

" . . . receiving those who return to Me in repentance." Bonwetsch translates: " . . . aufnehmend die sich zu mir in Bekehrung Bekehrenden." K A read here: *obrashtajushtichsja kōmne obrashtenijem*.<sup>5</sup> It will be seen that the English word "repentance" obscures the fact that in the Slavonic reading the word is cognate with the verb "return."<sup>6</sup> The German translation, though more literal, does not adequately reflect the Slavonic construction, which runs literally: "those who return to me with a return." This construction strongly suggests an underlying Hebrew

<sup>1</sup> ICC, "Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians" (Edinburgh, 1915), ad iv, 17.

<sup>2</sup> Polny Tzerko—Slavyanski Slovar, Moscow, 1900, p. 745a, with express reference to 2 Co. iv, 17, and 1 Thess. ii, 6. Other meanings, akin to "burden," are given at p. 744b. It is interesting that DELITZSCH, in his Hebrew translation of the NT (13th edition, Berlin, 1904), uses in 1 Thess. ii, 6, *yeqar*, having employed *kabhodh* in the first part of the verse.

<sup>3</sup> BASOR, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10-12, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, New Haven, 1951, p. 37, note 22.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 68-69, note 11.

<sup>5</sup> TIKHONRAVOV, p. 76; PORFIR'EV, p. 129. The last word is omitted by S.

<sup>6</sup> The noun for "repentance" proper is derived from the root *ka*, as is the case in most Slav languages. See F. MIKLOSICH, "Die Christliche Terminologie der Slavischen Sprachen" in *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Academie der Wissenschaften*, vol. 24, Vienna, 1876, p. 45. *Obrashtenije*=Heb. *teshubhah* (Comp. Slavonic Bible, Gen. iii, 16, where it is used in agreement with LXX, Old Latin and Syriac versions, and see MIKLOSICH, *loc. cit.*, on "Bekehrung").

original 'eth hashshabhim 'elay bithshubhah or perhaps 'eth haḥozerim . . . The Slavonic construction could scarcely be explained by any other supposition.<sup>1</sup>

(d) CHAP. XXXI (Box, p. 84)

" . . . and I will burn with fire those (i.e., the heathen nations) . . . who have ruled among them." The editor of the English translation points out that "among" means here "over," but overlooks the obvious Hebraism *mashelu* (or: *radu*) *bahem*.

The following examples are avowedly more conjectural and are offered as a contribution to the methodical exegesis of the "Apocalypse of Abraham."

(e) CHAP. XIV (Box, p. 54)

Abraham is instructed by his angel-guide to say to Azazel: " . . . thy heritage is . . . with the men whose portion thou art, and (who) through thy being exist . . ."<sup>2</sup> Bonwetsch translates: "und durch dein Sein sind sie." The Slavonic text K reads: "bytiem tvoim sut tii," while A reads instead of the last two words *suditi* (judge).<sup>3</sup>

The passage is a problematic one. It may mean that the men who are Azazel's portion have been assigned to him from the beginning. Box is inclined to think that the idea is predestinarian<sup>4</sup> and this is also implied by Bonwetsch in his tentative translation of *bytiem tvoim* in his notes, by "*deines Ursprungs*."<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, A K speak of Azazel's rebellion against God and the three texts know of the vesture which in heaven was formerly Azazel's and of his immortality, both transferred to Abraham. Now, if we assume that "through thy being they exist" represents a Hebrew original, the phrase could be rendered literally in the phraseology of DSD: *ובהיותך הווים הם*. The gerundial form *בהיות* is employed three times in DSD, namely, at III, 16 [*sic*], X, 8, and X, 10, in what seems to be the rather unusual sense of "so long as ——— exists," "throughout ———'s being," "while ——— exists." This, we suggest, might be the meaning of *bytiem tvoim* in our "Apocalypse," that is, "so long as you (Azazel) exist they are (in being)." The instrumental sense of the Slavonic *bytiem tvoim* could, then, be due to a mistranslation of the *beth* preposition in the Hebrew original, and the passage would yield good sense

<sup>1</sup> Text A reads *obrashtajushtisja*, which we take to be a mere error. It must be mentioned, however, that the text appears to have the letter "m" above the line between the "i" and "s." This would make the form dative and could be a literal rendering of a *lamedh* preposition used as *nota accus*.

<sup>2</sup> Omitted by S.

<sup>3</sup> PORFIR'EV, p. 121; TIKHONRAVOV, p. 64.

<sup>4</sup> P. 55, note 1

<sup>5</sup> P. 25, note to line 26.

without reference to Azazel's origin. It would relate to Azazel's function since the defection from his erstwhile allegiance.

(f) CHAP. XXIII (Box, p. 71).

Abraham asks: "O Eternal Mighty One! wherefore has Thou willed to effect that evil should be desired in the hearts of men since Thou indeed art angered over that which was willed by Thee, at him who is doing *what is unprofitable in Thy counsel*." The italicised phrase is rendered by Bonwetsch "*mit deinem Ratschluss das Unnütze*." A possible alternative translation suggested by Bonwetsch runs: "*in deinem Ratschluss Gewollte, dem der das Unnütze*."<sup>1</sup> Tennant, relying, it would seem, mainly on Bonwetsch, translates the phrase under discussion: "who deals frowardly with Thy decree."<sup>2</sup> SAK read: *nepoleznoju v svete tvojem*.<sup>3</sup>

It will be observed that all three translations emend *v svete* (i.e., "in the world" or "in the light") to *v suvete* (i.e., "in the counsel," "in the decision," etc.)—a legitimate procedure, in view of the unmistakable confusion of *svet* and *suvet* elsewhere in the "Apocalypse."<sup>4</sup> Of the three renderings, however, only that by Landsman in the English edition corresponds to the Slavonic. Bonwetsch, clearly, strains the meaning of the Slavonic preposition *in* as well as of the ablative form of the noun and the possessive pronoun to mean *with*, which would require the instrumental case, and this betrays his doubts about the meaning of *suvet* in the context. Tennant's rendering paraphrases the Slavonic still farther and as a result does rather less than justice to the impressively objective formulation of the problem by Abraham.

The Slavonic verb "to profit" or "to avail" as well as the nouns and adjectives derived from it correspond, generally speaking, to the Hebrew *ho'il* (*hiph'il*) and its derivatives.<sup>5</sup> As for "*counsel*," it corresponds in our passage to the Hebrew *'eṣah* in the sense of God's "design," His idea of what is right. In this sense *'eṣah* occurs both in the O.T. and in DTH and DSD as a parallel to

<sup>1</sup> P. 34, lines 10-11.

<sup>2</sup> *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin*, Cambridge, 1903, p. 194, note 2.

<sup>3</sup> S is apparently corrupt unless the form is connected with *svet'stvo*, but we adopt a variant cited by TIKHONRAVOV, p. 48, note 1; for A see TIKHONRAVOV, p. 71, and for K PORFIR'EV, p. 125. Minor orthographic peculiarities are ignored in the present study.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. e.g., TIKHONRAVOV, p. 49 and p. 73, with PORFIR'EV, p. 126, where the latter text reads three times *suvet* against *svet* in the other two texts; K's reading is obviously the only possible one. Comp. also TIKHONRAVOV, p. 47 and p. 71, with PORFIR'EV, p. 125, where K's reading appears to be the better. The latter passage corresponds to chap. xxiii (Box, p. 70 and note 8, *ibid.*, and BONWETSCH, p. 33): "this is the human world."

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Slavonic Bible*: Is. xxx, 5; xlv, 9, 10; Je. ii, 8; vii, 8; xii, 13; xvi, 19; Jb. xv, 3; Pr. x, 2, and xi, 4. See also F. MIKLOSICH, *Lexicon Paleoslovenico—Graeco Latinum*, Vienna, 1862-1865, p. 617a, for the verbs *polsevat* and *polstit* and cognate nouns.



*maḥashabbah*.<sup>1</sup> The Slavonic passage, then, fits literally and elegantly the Hebrew **אֵת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִזְעִיל בְּעֵצְתְּךָ**

(g) CHAP. XXIX (Box, p. 79)

"... that is the relief (granted) by the heathen to the people who proceed from thee, in the last days, in this twelfth hour of my final age." Bonwetsch renders the Slavonic literally: "*das ist die Nachlassung von den Heiden*." SAK read: *tu est' oslaba ot jazyk* (Tikhonravov, p. 51 and p. 75; Porfir'ev, p. 128).

There can be little doubt about the meaning of the word "*oslaba*."<sup>2</sup> Both Bonwetsch and Box take it to be the equivalent of the Greek "*anesis*" and Box expressly equates it with the Hebrew *menuḥah*.<sup>3</sup> It must be noted, however, that the English translation departs considerably from the Slavonic by adding in brackets the word "granted" and by changing the preposition "*from*" to "*by*." Box, though he admits that the passage is difficult and obscure, bases his tentative explanation entirely on the English translation. "Perhaps," he writes, "the 'relief' spoken of means the mitigation of the process of 'hardening' that has taken place in Israel (by its rejection of Jesus), which is brought about by the adhesion of some (a remnant) in Israel to the new faith in conjunction with great numbers who are streaming in from the Gentile world."<sup>4</sup>

A number of considerations militate against the acceptance of the explanation suggested by Box. To begin with, the Slavonic preposition *ot*, on which the agreement of the texts is impressive, is treated as if it meant "*granted by*" contrary to its plain meaning "*from*." Then, the word "*oslaba*" cannot by itself convey the sense of "mitigating a process of hardening" in a spiritual sense, even if it could be assumed that the readers of this "Apocalypse" were familiar with St. Paul's unique metaphor. It would certainly not be possible to read this meaning into the Hebrew word *menuḥah*, which Box implies might have stood in the original text. Nor is Box's citation of *Rom. XI, 25*<sup>5</sup> strictly relevant, since so far from "all Israel" being saved, only some of Abraham's descendants are depicted as worshipping the man who is seen emerging from among those ranged on the "left." Such an interpretation would, moreover, be at variance with the eschatological description of Israel's redemption in chapters XXIX-XXXI on the one hand, and possibly also with the ideal temple ritual as described in chapter XXV on the other.

<sup>1</sup> Mi. iv, 12 (and antithetically Pr. xix, 21); DTH, *Meg. Gen.* ii, plate ix, ll. 8-9, and DSD xi, 18-19. Comp. also DSD iii, 16, and xi, 11.

<sup>2</sup> D'YACHENKO, p. 389a: "liberty" ("being free" = Russian *svobodnost'*), "relief," "concession" (= Russian *l'gota*). *Oslaba* is used in the *Slavonic Bible* (for *anesis*) in Acts xxiv, 23.

<sup>3</sup> BONWETSCH, p. 38, line 19; Box, p. 79, note 1.

<sup>4</sup> Box, *ibid.*, note 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

It would perhaps not be too bold to conjecture that a Hebrew text before a Greek translator had *hamminḥah*, unvocalised, which the translator took to be a "defective" spelling of *hammenuḥah* and which, in conjunction with the Hebrew preposition *מן* suggested to him *anesis*, that is, relief from the afflictions suffered by the Jews at the hands of the Gentiles.

Pragmatically speaking, the assumption that the original text was in Hebrew and had *hamminḥah* and not *hammenuḥah* or a synonym of it, yields a consistent explanation. The explanation has the merit of not conflicting with the eschatological sequel. Moreover, it is in harmony with the conception of Jesus in our "Apocalypse," a conception which is Messianic neither in the Jewish nor in the Christian sense, but rather that of a righteous teacher, though perhaps of a supernatural order. That would be the kind of shrewd and temperate interpolation one would associate with an early Jewish Christian or Ebionite.

We conclude, then, that the original text may well have been . . . *zoth hamminḥah min haggoyim l . . .*, "this is the gift from the Gentiles to . . ."

(h) CHAP. XXXI (Box, p. 84)

Describing the redemption of Israel to Abraham, God says: ". . . and (I) will send mine Elect One, having in him all my power, "one measure" . . . The last two words are translated by Bonwetsch: *Ein Mass*, while the Slavonic texts have *meru edinu* in the accusative.<sup>1</sup>

The phrase "one measure" is a difficult one in the context. The only attempt to interpret it comes, again, from Box. According to Box the phrase means "a measure of all the divine attributes—he [i.e., the Elect One] reflects in little the totality of the divine character. This (continues Box) is an exalted conception, but does not seem to imply more than that the Messiah is a divinely endowed man, full of the power of the Holy Spirit (Is. xi, 1), which makes him free of sin (Ps. Sol. xvii, 36f). He is not depicted as a supernatural angelic being like Metatron. He is sent by God at the appointed time . . ."<sup>2</sup>

The above interpretation strikes us as not a little artificial. The only point that could be urged in its favour is the fact that in the "Apocalypse" the function of the "Elect One" appears to be limited to the summoning of the people of Israel from the nations. Against this, however, must be set the fact that the Slavonic texts have "powers" in the plural (*sily*),<sup>3</sup> a word the natural meaning of which is not that attributed to it by Box. D'yachenko, it is true, indicates the not infrequent use of the singular "*sila*" in the sense

<sup>1</sup> TIKHONRAVOV, p. 53 and p. 76; PORFIR'EV, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> P. 84, note 6.

<sup>3</sup> See note 1.

of "nature," "quality" or "property" (Russian: *svoistvo*),<sup>1</sup> but this, again, will not assist us if we interpret the word negatively, as "being free of sin," against the plural form in the text. One could think of "powers" as *gebhuroth* in the sense of God's "manifestations" or "wonders," but, clearly, one cannot be dogmatic on this point.

The relevant part of the passage, as it stands in the Slavonic text, runs: "*having in him all my powers one measure.*" It is a legitimate conjecture that the words "*one measure*" are a translation of the original Hebrew *bath 'ahath*—a well-known phrase in Mishnaic usage meaning "suddenly," "at once."<sup>2</sup> If we assume, for example, a Hebrew text ושלחתי את בחירי ובו כל נבירותי בת אחת it becomes obvious how simple it would be for a translator to render the last two words as an additional object in the subordinate clause, instead of treating them as adverbial to the principal clause "I will send . . ." A Greek or Hellenised Jewish translator would be more likely to be familiar with the phrase *bath 'ahath* in its Biblical meaning of "one measure" than with its other meaning in late post-Biblical Hebrew. Moreover, the "sudden" appearance of the Messiah would not only be in harmony with the tempo of events as unfolded in Chapter XXXI, but it would also show affinity with descriptions in later Hebrew literature.<sup>3</sup> Nor would such a conception be alien to the New Testament.<sup>4</sup>

ARIE RUBINSTEIN.

Manchester.

<sup>1</sup> P. 596a-b.

<sup>2</sup> H. YALON has shown recently ("*Melilah*," vol. iii-iv, Manchester University Press, 1950, p. 112) on the basis of MSS. of the Mishnah that the oldest and main form of the phrase was probably *bath 'ahath* and that the preposition *bêth* was added later to emphasise the adverbial sense. It is instructive to compare this with similar adverbial phrases having *ben* or *bar* as constituents (*ibid.*, pp. 111-112). JASTROW and BEN YEHUDA note only the phrase *bebhath 'ahath*. For a possible explanation of the origin of the phrase see BEN YEHUDA'S *Thesaurus*, vol. II, p. 652b, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., QALIR in his poem "*bayyamim hahem*": "On the first month, which is the month of Nisan, verily on the fourteenth day, Menahem ben 'Amiel (*i.e.*, Messiah son of David) suddenly (*pith'om*) will come, in the valley of 'Arbel his goodness will spring forth . . ." This idea was probably taken from "*Sefer Zerubbabel*." Sa'adyah Gaon knew much of the material contained in the latter as a "tradition of the ancients" (see the paper by M. N. ZOBEL in "*Rav Sa'adyah Gaon*," ed. J. L. FISHMAN, Jerusalem, 1943, esp. p. 185—whence our quotation is taken).

<sup>4</sup> Mt. xxiv, 37-39, 44, 50; 1 Thess. v, 2.



## JEWISH PRINTERS OF NON-JEWISH BOOKS IN THE FIFTEENTH & SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Notwithstanding the careful research that has been devoted to the early history of Hebrew typography, in which non-Jews such as Daniel Bomberg took so important a part, little attention has been paid hitherto to the participation of Jews in the art of printing, in the more general sense, in its early days. Clearly, this was a more difficult matter by far than the other. For there was at this time a universal prejudice against, and sometimes an outright prohibition of, the employment of Jews in handicrafts, sometimes reinforced by specific exclusion from the printing industry: with the result that they were often compelled to have recourse to Gentiles even for producing their liturgical works. On the other hand, much general printing, too, whether in Latin or in the vernacular, was at this time theological in scope; and, in an age when Jews were forbidden to bind Christian missals, etc. (as was the case in Spain, for example, from the beginning of the fifteenth century),<sup>1</sup> it was obviously paradoxical that they should be suffered to print such volumes. But in spite of these difficulties, and others arising from social discrimination, linguistic divergence, and cultural disparity, Jews figure in the story of general typography in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—in one case, at least, significantly—in Spain, in Portugal, and in Italy.

The record begins in the last-named country, very shortly after the earliest recorded production there of the Hebrew printing-press (Reggio di Calabria, 1475) and in much the same region. It is a perplexing story. About 1478 (the precise date is unfortunately not given) the great Neapolitan printer, Francesco del Tuppo, who was associated with some of the loveliest Italian book production of the age, produced in Naples a handsome edition of Dante's *Divina Commedia*. The orderly reader must have found it somewhat incongruous to be confronted at the end of the Purgatorio, in place of the pious valedictory not unusual after the various sections, by the words: "Let the unhappy Jew blush for shame" (*Erubescat Judeus Infelix*). He would, however, have found a partial explanation of this interruption at the end of the entire work, where the place of the normal colophon is taken by a letter addressed by the

<sup>1</sup> See the constitutions of Alfonso V of Aragon (1419) in F. BAER, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien*, I, 847. "Mestre Abram de Carasona, ligador de libres," who would seem to be a Jew, is mentioned in a document of 1379 in J. E. SERRANO Y MORALES, *Reseña histórica de las imprentas . . . en Valencia*, Valencia, 1898-99, p. 433.

printer to the elected representatives (*electi*) of the City of Naples, thanking them for their support. This is in the form of a violent tirade against the Jews—beginning with the overthrow of Jerusalem by Titus, coming down to the Ritual Murder trial at Trent “not long since” (this assists us to fix the date of the volume) and ending with a virulent attack upon a Jewish business rival who apparently had the temerity to enter into competition with him:

. . . Wherefore I, recently wishing to print Dante, who is so bound up with our Faith (treating as he does of the rewards of the blessed and the pains of the wicked) there arose against me an arrogant Jew (*fiero Iudio*), who is certainly one of those who called to Pilate: “His blood be on us and on our children.” He from every side endeavoured to make me desist from this work, finding plausible reason for his action: whether he was unduly favoured or not is no matter for discussion at present. However, since you considered it to be in the interest of the Commonwealth, you defended me and helped me; for which I am deeply grateful, though yet full of indignation for the outcome that I have seen. Let the Jew, with his favour, proceed to what he will: I will turn to Justinian [*i.e.*, the Law] and repose my weary limbs.

It is not very easy to comprehend the full significance of this extraordinary outburst. What, however, is clear is that after Del Tuppo had begun work on his Dante edition, a Jew procured some sort of judicial or administrative order compelling him to stop. There can have been no inherent objection to the publication of the *Divina Commedia*: it is therefore probable that the Jew claimed that it was in some way a breach of his copyright—*i.e.*, that he had been granted a monopoly for the publication, or that Del Tuppo’s edition would have confronted one in which he was engaged with unfair competition. Del Tuppo was therefore ordered to desist, and he seems to admit that the other had the letter of the law on his side. Later on, however, owing to the favour of the *electi*, he was able to resume work.

Del Tuppo’s words make it virtually certain that there was an antecedent edition of the *Divina Commedia* published by a Jew, presumably at Naples, just before his own. There is only one edition to which he can possibly allude here: the anonymous edition which appeared in Naples in 1477, the printing being completed on April 12 of that year.<sup>1</sup> It is, as a matter of fact, the fourth edition of that great work to see the light of day, being preceded only by the three editions (Foligno, Mantua, and Venice) of 1472; it is a handsome quarto volume, now extremely rare, and is considered to present a more satisfactory text than any of the former. That it

<sup>1</sup> For this edition, see *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, § 7961; FAVABRESCIANO, *La stampa a Napoli nel xv secolo*, ii § 195. I have dealt with this topic in a study (based on the copy in the Bodleian Library), *A Jewish Printer in Naples, 1477*, to appear in print shortly.

was produced by a Jew seems all the more probable in view of the fact that the colophon gives the date in the form *Adi xii del mese di Aprile, M.CCCC. LXXVII*, without the habitual (though not indeed invariable) "anno domini" or "anno salutis," and ends with the valediction, *Laus Deo*, in a neutral formula, without any Christological flavour. (That April 12, 1477, was a Saturday—i.e., the Jewish Sabbath—has no necessary bearing on the problem; the final stage of the work could quite easily have been carried out after nightfall.) Moreover, the mere fact that the volume does not mention the name of the printer is itself indirect evidence to its Jewish affiliation; as we shall see, there are parallels to this as well. There can in fact be little doubt that as early as 1477 a Jewish printer was at work producing non-Jewish literature in the south of Italy, and that the fourth known edition of the *Divina Commedia* was a Jewish production. In consequence perhaps of his brush with Del Tuppo, he was driven out of business, and no other production of his can be identified.

We must now leave Italy for a while, and turn our attention to Spain. It was formerly believed that the history of general printing in this country went back to the same year as the beginning of recorded Hebrew printing in Italy; for it was in 1475 (when the first dated Hebrew book appeared in Reggio di Calabria) that Lambert Palmart set up his printing-press in Valencia. It is now established, however, that he was anticipated certainly two, and perhaps four, years earlier at Segovia.<sup>1</sup> The first dated production of the Spanish Hebrew press is as it seems of 1476, being Rashi's commentary on the Bible produced by Solomon ibn Alkabez at Guadalajara probably (not, however, certainly, for the colophon is not quite clear) in this year. An exciting discovery in the Inquisitional Archives has introduced us to the name of Juan de Lucena, who is stated to have been engaged with his daughters in printing books in the Hebrew character at Toledo and Montalban at about the same time, or possibly even earlier.<sup>2</sup> However, no products of his press can be identified.

Later on, a significant name in Hebrew typography in Spain is that of Solomon ben Maimon Zalmati, who was associated with the Hebrew printing-house of Eliezer [ben] Alantansi at Hijar in

<sup>1</sup> F. VINDEL, *Origen de la Imprenta en España*, 1935, attempts to establish the existence of printing in Spain, at Valencia as well as Segovia, as early as 1470.

<sup>2</sup> MANUEL SERRANO Y SANZ, *Noticias biograficas de Fernando de Rojas, autor de "La Celestina," y del impresor Juan de Lucena*, in *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 1902, pp. 245-328. The early history of Hebrew typography in Spain is, however, to a great extent a matter of conjecture, owing to the widespread and, to a great degree, wanton destruction in that country at the close of the medieval period. In 1497 the Grand Inquisitors informed those of Valencia that they had heard that there were many persons in the realm who possessed books written in Hebrew concerning the Law of Moses, medicine and surgery, and other sciences and arts: all such works were to be collected and burned within eight days. (SERRANO Y MORALES, *op. cit.*, p. 151.)



1490—probably from as early as 1485.<sup>1</sup> He seems to have been a somewhat restless, as he was indubitably a versatile, character: a native of Jativa, a goldsmith by profession, resident successively in Murcia, Valencia, and Híjar, and sufficiently erudite in matters Hebrew to correspond on a matter of Jewish law (concerning a bill of divorce written by a Marrano) with the famous Rabbi Šemah Duran, and to append an elegant metrical poem as colophon to a Hebrew publication with which he was associated.<sup>2</sup> The other outstanding figure among our *dramatis personæ* is Alfonso Fernandez de Córdoba, the silversmith and typecutter who was at work at Valencia from 1473 and was there associated with Lambert Palmart in his most memorable production, the Valencian Bible (*Biblia en limosin*) of 1477-78; he produced independently also the *Summula Confessionis* of St. Anthony of Florence (Valencia, 1477), and is conjectured to have been responsible for other works which appeared here in 1484-86.<sup>3</sup> Finally, mention must be made of the notary, Dr. Gabriel Luis Arinyo, who was also active locally in the newly established printing craft.

In 1483 the last named was, as it seems, working in Valencia, and had begun to produce a commentary on the Psalms by the Administrator of the See, Jaime Perez, titular Bishop of Cristopoli.<sup>4</sup> It proved apparently too expensive or too ambitious a project, and he needed help. But at this time, as it happens, De Córdoba was in great difficulty. He had got into trouble at Valencia and had been condemned to death *in absentia*—apparently for a minor crime.<sup>5</sup> He had accordingly fled the city and removed his presses

<sup>1</sup> Zalmati is specifically mentioned in the colophon as the person financially responsible for the production of the Híjar Pentateuch of 1490, which is clearly from the same press and has some of the same decorations (e.g., the initial at the beginning of the Ten Commandments) as the undated edition produced at this place about the same time by Eliezer Alantansi (cf. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. xi, 107). This seems to make the association between the two certain. And, if Alantansi produced the volume financed by Zalmati in 1490, it is reasonable to suppose that Zalmati may have financed the volumes produced by Alantansi from 1485 to 1487-88.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. B. FRIEDBERG, *Hebrew Typography in Italy, Spain, etc.* (in Hebrew, Antwerp, 1934), pp. 74-76; F. BAER, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien*, II, 512; and the authorities quoted below concerning his activity in Valencia. But it is not certain that all these sources refer to the same person; in some he is called Solomon *alias* Maimon Zalmati, in others Solomon ben Maimon, or (in the Inquisitional process published by BAER) Maimon.

<sup>3</sup> C. HAEBLER, *Bibliografía Iberica del siglo xv*, Nos. 20, 49, 535, 536; F. VINDEL, *El arte tipografico en Valencia*, 1946.

<sup>4</sup> DR. JOSHUA BLOCH, in his *Early Hebrew Printing in Spain and Portugal*, 1938 (reprinted from the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, May, 1938), states on p. 21 that Perez was "a Jewish convert to Christianity" (improving on PROF. A. MARX' statement in *JQR*, 1920, p. 107), but there is neither authority nor likelihood for this assertion.

<sup>5</sup> HAEBLER (*La Typographie Ibérique du 15e siècle*, pp. 11-12) conjectures, and BLOCH (*op. cit.*, pp. 21, 23) repeatedly asserts, that the condemnation was by the Inquisition and because of his friendly association with Jews. But this is completely out of the question. No person capitally condemned by the Inquisition would have ventured himself in the place where the sentence was promulgated, nor could the Governor have suspended the sentence, nor could the King have abrogated it.

to Murcia; he had nevertheless now ventured back to Valencia again, probably under a temporary safe-conduct. Here on July 31, 1483, he entered into an agreement with Arinyo in the presence of the notary Juan Gamiça, binding himself for the next year to take over the technical side of the other's publications. Arinyo, for his part, was to defray the expenses and to receive the income; he bound himself, moreover, to solicit for his collaborator a safe-conduct from the Governor of Valencia so as to enable him to live and work in the city, and to settle this difficulty of his finally by obtaining for him the royal pardon within eighty days.

How, however, was Arinyo to obtain the capital for this enterprise, which was obviously expected to be an expensive one? It seems that, while living at Murcia, De Córdoba had entered into relations (perhaps even a formal association) with Solomon Zalmati and had before this put him into touch with Arinyo, coming to Valencia in fact as his representative: for the two Christian enthusiasts had already agreed between themselves to admit him to their partnership for printing the Bishop's writings. This was clarified in a second contract made on the same day, in which it was specified that in fact the funds for the work were to be advanced by him, not by Arinyo, and that he was to receive one half of the profits which resulted from it. (The reason for this double contract is not easy to see, unless it was considered unwise for the unbeliever to be immediately and formally associated with the printing of a Christian theological work.) This contract was agreed to by De Córdoba in Zalmati's name. But, as a matter of fact, he seems to have been exceeding his mandate, for he had not actually received power of attorney to act on the other's behalf. He accordingly returned later in the same day and, while admitting this, promised to use his influence to induce him to confirm the agreement, either in person or by attorney, within one month.<sup>1</sup>

There is no reason to doubt that the partnership was formally confirmed within the stipulated time. The result became apparent in the following year, when there was published at Valencia the *Commentum in Psalmos* by Jaime Perez. No printer's name is indeed given, but there can be no doubt that this is the book "by the Lord Bishop" referred to in the contracts mentioned above—

---

<sup>1</sup> See the remarkable series of documents (not of the Inquisition, as stated by BLOCH, *op. cit.*, p. 21) published by J. E. SERRANO Y MORALES, *Reseña histórica de las imprentas . . . en Valencia*, pp. 149-158. It may be pointed out that in these, according to the Editor's reading, the Jew's name figures repeatedly as "Maimon alias Solomon Zalman" (not "Zalmati," though there cannot be any doubt as regards the identification). "Zalman" is the normal German-Jewish agnomen for Solomon (a fact of which the Spanish editor is unlikely to have been aware, and by which he is unlikely therefore to have been misled). This would seem to indicate that he was an immigrant craftsman from Germany, and would suggest that the history of Hebrew typography in that country is to be thrown back longer by far than has hitherto been believed. But it would be extremely difficult in that case to explain how the form "Zalmati" developed, while "Maimon" is a characteristically Spanish name.

all the more so since the type is similar to (though not indeed identical with) that used by De Córdoba in other publications.

This is not the only Latin work that may be associated with the name of Solomon Zalmati. In the following year, 1485, there appeared probably at Valencia the *Opuscula* of Jaime Perez (including his *Tractatus contra judaeos*!) and the *Vida de S. Ana*, both probably produced by the same consortium. There has been ascribed to De Córdoba, moreover, another work of great importance—the *Manuale Cæsaraugustanum* (Saragossan Ritual)—believed to have been printed at Hajar in 1486; for in this beautiful work both the characters and decorations are similar to those which he designed and used. The association of this with Zalmati seems to be made certain by one curious fact. There is around the first page a superb decorative border, which has been described as being of a Jewish type, and was presumably designed and engraved by De Córdoba himself. As it happens, this same border appears again in an undated Hebrew Pentateuch produced also at Hajar about this time (obviously before August, 1492, when the Jews were expelled from Spain, and probably before 1489) by Eliezer Alantansi, with whom Zalmati was provably associated<sup>1</sup>; later on this same border was twice used in Lisbon in 1489 by Eleazár Toledano, and again in due course in Constantinople in several Hebrew books produced between 1505 and 1509. It has even been suggested that De Córdoba may have engraved the Hebrew letters which were used in the Hajar press; but this must remain pure conjecture (though indeed we are specifically informed that the earliest Spanish Hebrew printer, Solomon Alkabez, employed a non-Jewish craftsman, Pedro of Guadalajara, to cut his types).<sup>2</sup> It is not easy to explain the fact that the same important decorative feature was shared by the Latin and Hebrew presses at Hajar except on the assumption of a personal link between the two. It thus appears to be reasonably certain that Solomon Zalmati's partnership with De Córdoba in the production of the works of Bishop Perez extended also to the *Manuale Cæsaraugustanum*; the anonymity of the production is in this case all the more readily to be understood.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. MARX, *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 299-300 (and, for the Hajar publications, pp. 293-294). Portions of this same border ascribed to De Córdoba are used also for the decorations between the books in the Pentateuch financed by Zalmati. If this implies that it was broken up for the purpose, it must have been recut for use at Lisbon and Constantinople, and the date will have to be reconsidered. M. MARX, *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore*, I, i, 27, attempts to establish the date of the *Manuale Cæsaraugustanum* as 1487, and of the Pentateuch therefore as 1487-88.

<sup>2</sup> I. SONNE in *Bibliofilia*, xxxix, 195-204, and *Kirjath Sepher*, xiv, 367-368. The person here in question is presumably identical with the "Maestre Pedro" who cut the type for CALVACA'S *Espejo de la Cruz*, Seville, 1486.

<sup>3</sup> By this time, as it seems, ARINYO was at work in Murcia, where he published in 1487 the works of the *converso* theologian ALFONSO DE CARTAGENA. It is perhaps only a coincidence that Zalmati, too, was connected with this town, but some formal association between the two is not improbable.



It is necessary at this point to devote some attention to another name that has been placed on record, of a Spanish Jew who was engaged at this time in non-Hebrew printing. According to a statement made by Dr. Joshua Bloch, of the New York Public Library, in his important monograph, *Early Hebrew Printing in Spain and Portugal* (reprinted from the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, May, 1938), Eliezer Alantansi, Zalmati's associate in the Hijar press, would have to be added to our list, for (before he had begun his Hebrew printing) "he had learned the craft previously, while employed as the manager of the printing shop of Alfonso Fernandez de Córdoba in Valencia. It was there that he had gained considerable experience in the technique of printing, which later served him in good stead in his own press in Hijar." Bloch gives as his authority for this remarkable statement K. Haebler, *Typographie Ibérique*, etc., Leipzig, 1902, p. 33. But Bloch, whether he has used the Spanish or the French text of this work, has clearly misunderstood it. Haebler does not mention Alantansi's association with De Córdoba, for which no particle of evidence or probability exists, and speaks only of the association between the latter and Zalmati, which has been described above. The introduction of the name of Alantansi into the history of general printing is thus due to sheer confusion; and it is regrettable that it has been necessary to devote space here to the elucidation of this elementary detail.

After the Expulsion from Spain in 1492, an important cultural centre still flourished for some while in the Peninsula, in Portugal. Here indeed the share of the Jews in intellectual life at this time was in some respects of overwhelming importance, so that Dom Manuel of Portugal was able to say that "The Renaissance found Portugal ready to receive its impetus because the way had already been prepared partly by the learned Portuguese Jews."<sup>1</sup> This was so particularly as regards printing; it is indeed the only country of the Christian world in which the part played by Jews in the art of typography in these early days was really of major, and even decisive, importance. Hebrew printing began in Portugal in 1487, non-Hebrew only in 1494; and, of the twenty-four known Portuguese incunabula, the first eleven in chronological sequence are Hebrew. Hence, whereas in other European countries the Jewish printers follow in the path blazed out by their non-Jewish fellow-workers, in Portugal they are actually the pioneers. It is not therefore surprising that Samuel de Orta, who produced four or five important Hebrew works at Leiria in 1492-97, is found also as a non-Hebrew printer.

There can be no doubt that he is to be identified with the "vir solers Magister Orta" who was responsible for the production

<sup>1</sup> DOM MANUEL OF PORTUGAL, *Early Portuguese Books, 1489-1600*, p. xlviii.

here of A. Zacuto's Tables and Perpetual Almanac (*Tabulæ Tabularum Coelestium motuum: sive Almanach Perpetuum*) of 1496, edited by Joseph Vecinho, the royal physician—the most important of the seven known Latin incunables printed in Portugal. This actually appeared indeed in two distinct editions, for some copies have the twenty folios containing the *canones* not in Latin but in Spanish. These are of special interest, for they constitute the only known incunable printed in the country with the text neither in Latin, nor in Portuguese, nor in Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> There has also been ascribed to Ortas a Leiria edition (undated) of the *Imitatio Christi* in Portuguese<sup>2</sup>; but no copy is recorded, and not merely the ascription, but even the existence of the work is (to say the least) questionable.

In Portugal, as in Spain, any consistent and protracted Jewish participation in the art of printing was violently ended by the great Expulsion, which here took place in 1497. We now accordingly have to divert our attention to Italy. Here, the most significant name in Jewish printing is that of Soncino. In the first generation, the most active member of the family had been Joshua Solomon Soncino, who (in association at the outset with his father, Israel Nathan) had been active in Soncino (Lombardy), Casalmaggiore, and then Naples from 1484 to 1492. He was, however, outdone in importance and ubiquity by his nephew, Gershom ben Moses Soncino, who produced all told at least ninety-six Hebrew works between 1489 and 1534, and whose itinerary can be marked by the places associated with his imprint: Soncino, Brescia, Barco, Fano, Pesaro, Ortona, Rimini, and then Salonica and Constantinople (where his son Eliezer continued his activity for some years after his death). Italian born, and brought up in the versatile humanistic tradition of Italian Jewry, his interests extended beyond the bounds of the conventional Jewish literature that had engaged the attention of his uncle and other members of his family. In 1502, accordingly, while his press was situated in Fano, he produced the first of a series of Latin and Italian works through which his name is memorable in the history of general printing in Italy. All told, in the course of the next quarter of a century he published something like one hundred such books, bearing the imprints, Fano, Pesaro, Ancona, Ortona, Rimini, and Cesena. In these his name figures

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, § vi. The fullest accounts of the Leiria edition of the Zacuto Tables are to be found *ibid.*, § vi; *Bibliografia Geral Portuguesa*, i (1941), pp. 152-179; and A. FONTOURA DA COSTA, *Bibliografia Náutica Portuguesa até 1700*. In a few copies of the work the letter to the Bishop is omitted. There were several subsequent editions (Venice 1496, 1498, 1489, 1525; Cologne 1502). The Salonica edition of 1568 is in Hebrew characters. The name of the Portuguese printer is almost invariably given as Abraham d'Ortas, but there is no authority for this; the Hebrew printer was Samuel d'Orta (Ortas) with his three sons, Abraham being responsible, as is believed, for cutting the types. In the Latin, the cognomen only figures.

<sup>2</sup> HAIN, *Repertorium*, § 9135.

in a Latin form, as Hieronymus (=Jerome, or Girolamo); but any lingering doubts as to the identification are settled by the fact that in one case both forms figure together, and in a Hebrew publication he specifically mentions his activity in Latin and the vernacular.<sup>1</sup> An Italian scholar has said of him that "he was second only to Aldo in the sumptuous novelty and perfection of his productions."

Much has been written about him and his work, and it is impossible here to do more than mention briefly a few points of special interest: How Francesco (Griffo) da Bologna cut for him an "improved" version of the italic type he had made just before for the great Aldo in Venice, thus understandably arousing the other's ire; how he produced in this type at Fano in 1503 a new edition of Petrarch, embodying material never previously used, which he unctuously dedicated to no less a person than Cesare Borgia; how he employed as literary editor the well-known humanist, Lorenzo Abstemio, who exhorted all those who owned unknown manuscripts of good Latinity to ensure immortality by sending them to him for publication<sup>2</sup>; how he was summoned back to Fano in 1508 after a brief absence to print the City Statutes, for which purpose a house and a proof-reader were placed at his disposal by the Priors; how he produced in addition to literary works many volumes of specifically Christian and theological significance, such as his beautiful edition of Cardinal Vigerio's *Decachordum christianum* illustrated with engravings perhaps by Florio Vavassore (Fano, 1507), the Privileges of the Eremitic Friars (Pesaro, 1515), and even an anti-Jewish polemic, Galatinus's *Arcana catholicæ veritatis* (Ortona, 1518), enriched with Hebrew verses in praise of the author—a species of work which he was obviously unable to refuse<sup>3</sup>; how he made use also of an elegant Greek type and—what was more remarkable—of Ethiopic characters, thus proving a pioneer in more ways than one; how a member of his family, Alberto Soncino (perhaps to be identified with his son, in Hebrew Eliezer), contributed a laudatory Latin distich to

<sup>1</sup> A great deal has been written on the typographical activity of the Soncino family: see especially G. MANZONI, *Annali tipografici dei Soncino*, Bologna, 1883-86; F. SACCHI, *I tipografi ebrei di Soncino*, Cremona, 1877; M. SOAVE, *Dei Soncino celebri tipografi*, Venice, 1878; M. MARX, *Gershom Soncino's, Wander-Years in Italy*, in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xi, 427-501, with a later article: in *A Tribute to Alexander Marx*, New York, 1943, pp. i-x; and A. M. HABERMAN, *The Soncino Family of Printers* (Hebrew), Vienna, 1933. My MS. 321 (*Amude haGolah*) was at one time in the hands of Hayyim Soncino, another son of Israel Nathan Soncino, who redeemed it from pawn.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. CASTELLANI, *Lorenzo Abstemio e la tipografia del Soncino a Fano*, in *Bibliofilia*, 1930; and his article, *Girolamo Soncino*, *ibid.*, ix (1907-08), pp. 23-31.

<sup>3</sup> For this curious episode, see SILVIO MAGRINI, *Perchè un tipografo ebreo stampò un'opera anti giudaica*, in *Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, x, 126-132. The work has much independent interest from the point of view of Jewish studies: e.g., in the fact that Reuchlin, under his Hellenic pseudonym "Capnio," figures (with his Dominican opponent Hochstraten) among the interlocutors. Some while after the publication, Amatus Lusitanus and Azariah de' Rossi discussed the work with a friend in a bookshop; see AMATI LUSITANI, *III Centuria*, § xlii.



his edition of Pindar's *De Bello Troiano* (Fano, 1515), notwithstanding the fact that it was disfigured by a vulgar anti-Jewish poem by Battista Guarini (*cur Judaei ferant litteram O*), and a smooth Italian sonnet to Andrea Senofonte's formulary of love-letters, *Flos Amoris* (Cesena, 1527)—a work made memorable by the fact that it was dedicated by the author to his publisher, a touching and even now unusual phenomenon<sup>1</sup>! In the long run, however, the difficulties against which he had to contend proved too much for him. In a Hebrew volume published at Rimini not long before this, he had announced his intention of giving up his non-Hebrew printing, and this was in fact his last publication in this sphere, or nearly so. In 1529 we find him at work in Salonica, and the next year in Constantinople, complaining how unfair competition had driven him from his native land.<sup>2</sup>

Some twenty-five years after Gershom Soncino ended his activity in Italy, the tradition of vernacular printing in that country was taken up, by persons of a wholly different background and working with a different object in view, at Ferrara. Here Hebrew printing had begun as early as 1477, and a new press had been set up by a certain Solomon Zarfati in 1551. But Ferrara contained at this time, besides the old-established native Jewish community and more recently arrived German immigrants, a large body of ex-Marranos from Spain and Portugal, attracted by the liberal policy of the House of Este. Among them was a certain Yom-tob ben Levi Athias, a Spaniard who had been known during the period when he had been forced to profess Christianity as Jeronimo de Vargas. Realising that the section of the community to which he belonged needed literature for their own requirements (to many of them, owing to their antecedents, Hebrew was inaccessible), he set up a press for the purpose. Here he published in 1552-53, so far as is known, four liturgical books, etc., in Spanish translations, the last of them in conjunction with Abraham Usque (previously Duarte Pinhel<sup>3</sup>). The latter then took over the work and produced in 1553-55 six more volumes, extending his interests from Spanish to Portuguese, and from liturgy to belles-lettres. Of the total of ten volumes, seven were liturgical (and Biblical) translations into Spanish; one was an original work of Jewish interest, in Portuguese;

<sup>1</sup> Among Geronimo Soncino's Italian publications were three editions of the poems of SERAFINO AQUILANO (1466-1500), whom his admirers called the Petrarch of his age (*Poesia*, Pesaro, 1504; *Poema*, Fano, 1505, dedicated to the Duchess of Urbino; *Poesie*, Pesaro, 1509), besides his *Opere Volgari* (Fano, 1516). This is of interest in view of the fact that a Jew named Judah ("Giuda Hebreo") had been among those who collaborated—together with persons of rank, such as Giuliano de' Medici—in the volume of poems in various languages published in his memory (Bologna, 1504).

<sup>2</sup> The suggestion that Gershom Soncino's printing in languages other than Hebrew went back, anonymously, to the fifteenth century has no evidence and little probability in its favour.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps identical with the author of EDUARDO PINELLI LUSITANI, *Latinae grammatice compendium, Tractatus de calendis* (Lisbon, 1543).

and the remaining two were secular works, one in either tongue.<sup>1</sup> All the productions of this press (except for some title-pages) are in Gothic characters—a fact which in itself seems to suggest the Iberian influence, as the roman and italic had by now become general in Italy.<sup>2</sup>

It is doubtful whether, as has sometimes been stated, the Spanish prayer-book of 1552 was actually the very first specimen of vernacular printing for Jewish use (other than those in Judaeo-Italian, etc., in Hebrew characters). There are references in the Inquisitional case spoken of above, involving the fifteenth-century Toledo printer, Juan de Lucena, to a *Cituri* (i.e., *Sidur*: Hebrew *siddur*) *de oraciones in romance*, which in the circumstances may possibly have been a printed work (this title is reproduced almost exactly in later publications). Moreover, the earliest Ferrara volume refers scornfully to the fact that “those [translations] printed hitherto are inaccurate.” The works here in question may possibly be the versions of the Penitential Prayers and of the Daily Prayers (accompanied by the original Hebrew) edited by Dr. Isaac Cavallero, which appeared at the Bragadin press in Venice in that same year. 1552.<sup>3</sup> These two volumes, however, produced by a non-Jewish printing establishment, do not fall within the scope of the present survey.

The vernacular publications of the Marrano press of Ferrara are of such rarity and such importance that it is desirable to list them, in detail, in chronological sequence.

## I. YOM-TOB ATHIAS

1552

1. Lybro de Oracyones de todo el año, traduzzydo del Hebrayco de verbo à verbo, de antiguos exemplares, por quanto

<sup>1</sup> The statement (*Hebrew Union College Annual*, xi, 499) that “Usque’s publications in Spanish and Portuguese are exclusively of Jewish literature” must thus be corrected.

<sup>2</sup> For fuller details and exhaustive references, see my article, *The Marrano Press at Ferrara, 1552-1555*, in *Modern Language Review*, xxxviii (1943), pp. 307-317. A revised and expanded form of this—the original version of the present article—was sent some eight years ago for publication to the *Journal of Jewish Bibliography*, edited from the New York Public Library, but all subsequent communications to the Editor concerning it have remained unanswered. I have therefore been compelled now to rely on memory for many details.

<sup>3</sup> The only complete copy of the Daily Prayers known to me (*Ordenança delas oraciones del Cedur del mes Ebraico y vulgar . . . copilado por el Doctor Ribi Isac hijo de Don Semto Cavallero, En Venecia MDLII*) is that in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, which has been brought to my attention by DR. ALEXANDER MARX. This edition was formerly ascribed to “c. 1580” (see STEINSCHNEIDER, *Cat. Bodl.*, § 2404): the Bodleian copy on which this conclusion was based lacks, however, the first title page, the second one (which has a somewhat different text) being undated. This edition was reprinted in Venice in 1622. There is a curious piece of evidence that the Spanish text was set up by a non-Jew. The typesetter had painstakingly learned that the Latin “et” was to be set as “&.” In setting up, therefore, the Blessing over the Law (necessary for the use of Marranos who could not read Hebrew) he rendered one phrase “*venathan lanu & toratò*.”

los ympresos hasta à qui estan errados, con muchas cosas acrescentadas de nuevo segun por la siguiente tabla se muestra.

8vo: dated 14th Sivan, 5312=6th June, 1552.

2. Sedur de Oraciones de mes con mucha diligencia visto y enmendado . . . ympresso por yndustria y depesa de Yon Tob Athias hyo de Levi Athias, en el mes de Sivan de 5312.

245 11., 24mo.

3. Orden de Silhoth el qual comiença en la luna nueva de Elul, que responde à Agosto y dura fasta Kipur q son quarenta noches de Contricion.

56 11., 24mo.

## II. YOM-TOB ATHIAS AND ABRAHAM USQUE

1553

4. Biblia en lengua española traduzida palabra por palabra dela verdad Hebrayca por muy excelentes letrados, vista y examinada por el oficio dela inquisicion.

16 ff+400 11.+3 11., folio.

As is well known, there are two editions of this work, the one dedicated to the Duke of Ferrara and the other to Doña Gracia Nasi: the former states that the work was edited "con yndustria y diligencia de Duarte Pinel, Portuguez" and printed "a costa y despeza de Jeronimo de Vargas, Español" on 1 March, 1553; in the other, for Jewish use, the names "Abrahã Usque" and "Yom Tob Athias, hijo de Levi Athias," and the Hebrew date 14 Adar, 5313, are substituted. Clearly, the one edition was intended for distribution among Jews, and the other among Christians. It is traditionally asserted that the former edition has the word *virgen* in the disputed passage of Isaiah vii, 14; whereas the other substitutes the word *moça* and moreover includes at the close of the volume a list of the *Haphtaroth*, or Prophetical lessons for Synagogal reading. I have shown elsewhere that this is not the case. The *Tabla de las Haphtaroth de todo el año* figures indifferently in copies of both editions: whereas the crucial word in the Isaiah passage is to be found as *virgen*, *moça*, or the non-committal transliteration *alma*, in the most bewildering fashion, regardless of whether the dedication and other details in the copy are in the "Jewish" or "Christian" form.

With the publication of the great Ferrara Bible, Yom-Tob Athias disappears from the scene. As he was as it seems born in Spain before the expulsion of 1490, he must by now have been advanced in years, and perhaps he now died. The work is now taken over wholly by his collaborator.

## III. ABRAHAM USQUE

1553

5. Orden de Roshasanah y Kipur, trasladado en Español, y de nuevo emedado por yndustria e y diligencia de Abrahã Usque Be Selomoh Usque Portuguez, y estampado en su casa y a su costa. En Ferrara à 15 de Elul, 5313.

262 ff., 12mo.



6. Psalterium De Daud en Hebraico dicho Thehylin, trasladado co toda fieldad verbo de verbo del Hebrayco: y Repartido come se deue leer Per cada dia del mes segun vso de los Antiguos. Estampado en Ferrara a 15. de Nouiembre, 1553.

225 pp.+II 11., 12mo.<sup>1</sup>

7. Consolaçam as tribulaçoens de Israel. Composto por Samuel Usque. Empresso en Ferrara en casa de Abraham aben Vsque 5313 Da criaçam a 7 de Setembro.

viii+281+iii ff., 8vo.<sup>2</sup>

1554

8. Vysyon Delectable de la Philosophia y artes liberales A do por muy sutil artificio se declaran altos secretos. Y por fin las xxiii Coplas de don George Manrique. Estampado en Ferrara, Março 1554.

4 ff.+171 11.+Index+poem by Manrique, 8vo.

Though this work (the printing of which was ended on 15 March) does not bear Abraham Usque's name, his printer's mark (an armillary sphere, copied from the symbol adopted by the Kings of Portugal) figures together with his initials both on the title-page and at the end.<sup>3</sup>

9. Hystoria de Menina y Moça, por Bernaldim Ribeyro, agora de novo estampada e con summa deligencia emendada. E assi algumas Eglogas suas com ho mais que na pagina seguinte se vera.

8vo.<sup>4</sup>

1555

10. Orden de oraciones de mes arreo. s. sin boltar de una a otra parte. Y la Orden de Hanucah, Pūrim y Pascuas de Pesah, Sebuoth y Succoth. 182 ff., 12mo.

<sup>1</sup> The details are given from the perhaps unique copy in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. DR. MARX informs me also that he has found two leaves from another issue, with certain unimportant typographical differences. I had formerly been able to conjecture the complete title only from that of an Amsterdam reprint of 1628, which adds to the foregoing the words " por el Señor A. Abenusque de Ferrera." It is possible that this addition occurred at this point in the other edition mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> There is a later reprint of this work (probably Amsterdam, about 1600) which reproduces the title-page and imprint, but through a misreading gives the date as " 27 de Setembro."

<sup>3</sup> Only two copies of this extremely rare work are known to me—in a private collection in Madrid and in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The subsequent history of this edition (whose author, apparently a Marrano, made considerable use of Maimonides, and in turn was quoted by Ibn Verga in the Hebrew chronicle *Shebhet Jehudah*) is curious. It was translated into Italian and published in Venice in 1556. This Italian edition was then translated back into Spanish by the ex-Marrano Francisco de Caceres and published at Frankfort in 1623, a reissue appearing in Amsterdam in 1663.

<sup>4</sup> Notwithstanding the wording of the title, this is, so far as is known, the first edition of this famous work—one of the most important imaginative productions of the sixteenth century. Only one copy of this edition is known to survive, that of the British Museum; the next one (a different version) being produced at Evora in 1557, and the third (based on the Ferrara issue) Cologne, 1559. It has been conjectured that the author, on being banished from the Portuguese court, went to Italy and was there befriended by the Usque family, who saw to the publication of his work. Another hypothesis, more fanciful, is that he is identical with Samuel Usque himself. See J. TEXEIRA REGO, *Estudos e Controversias*, 2nd series (Oporto, 1931).

With this publication, the Spanish and Portuguese press at Ferrara ended its activities.<sup>1</sup> It is not difficult to find the reason. The Talmud had been burned in Rome in 1553, and in the following year a rabbinical conference at Ferrara imposed a precautionary censorship on Hebrew books ; the great persecution of the Marranos at Ancona in 1556 changed the entire atmosphere so far as this sort of literary activity was concerned ; while the publication by Abraham Usque of a Hebrew elegy to commemorate the martyrs drew on him the animosity of Cardinal Ghislieri (subsequently Pope Pius V), who ordered the Duke of Ferrara to have the book burned and the author punished. It was not surprising therefore that, though he continued to publish in Hebrew for another couple of years, he now abandoned his Spanish and Portuguese printing for the use of the Marranos, whose relapse from Christianity it in a way encouraged and condoned. Henceforth, the centre for this type of activity passed for a time to Venice, where, however, it was in the hands of non-Jewish printers.<sup>2</sup>

One other Jewish printer of non-Hebrew works emerges, however, in Italy before the record comes to an end. In 1558 Hebrew printing had been begun in Riva di Trento by an enthusiastic Jewish physician, Dr. Jacob Marcaria, under the auspices of Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, Bishop of Trent since 1539. For four years he continued a fairly intense activity, producing some thirty-five works distinguished for their accuracy and their humanistic outlook. The series ends in 1562, perhaps because the great Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church, which was to last until 1565, reopened at Trent in that year ; since it was to deal with the problems of censorship, uncontrolled Hebrew printing almost on its threshold was no doubt considered tactless. Nevertheless, the existence of a printing press in Riva was useful to others besides Jews at a time like this, and it was not difficult to adapt it for non-Hebrew printing. This is not a matter of conjecture, for in 1563, after the Council had been in session for some months, there was issued under Marcaria's imprint, with the Papal coat-of-arms in the centre of the title-page, a slim brochure comprising a laudatory Latin poem in its honour by one Vincente Zannelli: *De Concilio Tridentino, et omnibus patribus in eo congregatis ad Illustrissimum, & Reverendiss. principem, & Cardinalem Ludovicum Madrutium. Vincentii Zannelli Thausignani Archipresbyteri Sylva. Ripae Tridentini, apud Iacobum Marcariae. 1563.*

<sup>1</sup> The late DR. LAZARUS GOLDSCHMIDT once informed me that he owned a Calendar in Spanish or Portuguese, which he ascribed to the Usque press. I am informed by Dr. Edelman, Curator of the Jewish Section of the Royal Library in Copenhagen, that he is unable to trace this at present in the collection. [I saw this Calendar in Spanish in GOLDSCHMIDT's house. J.L.T.]

<sup>2</sup> For the history of Hebrew printing in Venice, see the chapter devoted to that subject in my *History of the Jews in Venice* (Philadelphia, 1930), substantially reproduced in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 1932.

With this to guide us, we are compelled to ascribe to Marcaria's press also an entire series of small publications issued at Riva in the course of 1562, without any indication of the printer's name (itself perhaps a somewhat suspicious circumstance), but obviously identifiable by the similarity of types and especially of ornaments (including the Papal coat-of-arms on the title-page): e.g., *Oratio habita a reverendo patre Diamante*; *Oratio F. Maximiani Beniamini Cremensis* ("Ad instantiam Petri Antonii Alciatis"); *Oratio habita a reverendissimo D. Georgio Drascovitio* ("ad instantiam Baptistæ Bozolæ"); *Oratio habita a . . . d. Joanne Strazio* (idem); *Oratio per reverendum magistrum Angelum Ferrum* (idem); *Sermo . . . auctore Petro Mercato* (idem); *Oratio habita ab oratore D. Alberti ducis Bavarie*; and even such quintessentially theological works as *Quod non sit laicis calix permittendus . . . auctore Gasparo Cardillo Villalpanedo*, and perhaps *Constitutio ad removendos abusos* by the famous Cardinal Campeggio (this last work, however, appeared *sine loco*). A few similar works were sent for publication to Brescia and Padua, where there were established presses. But it is not far from the truth to say that, on the reassembly of the Council of Trent, the Jewish physician Marcaria was the unofficial printer for the assembled prelates. It is to be noted that the little work bearing his explicit imprint is apparently the last of the series, being of 1563, whereas the others are of 1562. It is possible that, emboldened by his success, he had now ventured to throw off the disguise of anonymity, and that this led to a reaction and brought about the closing of his press.<sup>1</sup>

The Council of Trent set the seal on the Counter Reformation; and henceforth the participation of Jews in Italian cultural as in social life was to be impossible.<sup>2</sup> In the next century, in a freer environment, Jewish printers were to begin their activity both in Hebrew and in the two Iberian languages in Amsterdam, and in due course a completely new and untrammelled tradition of vernacular printing was to develop here. This, though its beginnings lay less than half a century after Marcaria's timid experiment in Riva, belongs to another age.

CECIL ROTH.

Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> My conclusions are based on a detailed examination of the important collection of these publications in the Bodleian Library. I believe that they are listed in an article by G. BAMPI in the *Archivio Trentino*, II (1883), 213ff., not accessible to me (cf. FUMAGALLI, *Lex. Typ.*, p. 330). The Directory of the Council (*Nomi . . . delli Legati . . . nel Sacro Concilio Tridentino, MDLXII*) shews, as it seems to me, less evidence of being printed by Marcaria, or even in Trent.

<sup>2</sup> DR. MOSES MARX, in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xi, 499-500, suggests that the printers Millanges in Bordeaux and Pomar in Lyons were Marranos. But the names do not indicate this, and in any case persons who did not profess Judaism can hardly be taken into account here. The "convertite" whom he mentions, who maintained a printing press on the Giudecca (Venice) in the sixteenth century, were not "converts" (from Judaism) as he suspects, but Penitents.



# NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

## 1. NOTES ON A TEACHER AND A BOOK

In the following notes two expressions which occur in two separate sectarian documents are given a more precise interpretation and two important features of the belief and practice of the sects thereby elucidated.

### 1. MOREH HASSEDEQ

The Hebrew sectarian commentary on Habakkuk recovered from Khirbet Qumran refers several times to *moreh hassedeq* (I, 13 ; II, 2 ; V, 10 ; VII, 4 ; VIII, 3 ; IX, 9-10 ; XI, 5), identifying him with "the righteous" of Hab. I, 4, who is temporarily worsted by "the guilty one" (I, 13), and regarding him as divinely enlightened (VII, 4) and a patron and authority—though rejected and abused by the wicked—of the sect, if not its actual founder. However, the customary rendering "teacher of righteousness" is misleading. This teacher is the opponent of 'ish hakkazab "the man of falsehood" and hakkohen harasha' "the guilty priest." The kohen has acted presumptuously and betrayed his trust as a reliable source of *torah*, and it is in this respect that the *moreh hassedeq* provides a contrast to him. The term *sedeq* refers not to the moral content of his instruction but to the legitimacy of his status and the authenticity of his leadership, to the "rightness" of his office rather than to the uprightness of his exhortations. *Sedeq* has its basic forensic connotation of "that against which no case can be made out, genuineness, authenticity." Various forms of the root *ṣ d q* are similarly used in the Bible of unimpugnable or valid weights and measures, of legitimate rule and unimpeachable succession, and so also in other Canaanite dialects ; cf. *J.E.A.*, XXVI (1941), 63 inf. So in the Habakkuk commentary the title asserts the authority and the right to credence of "the true teacher" or "the right master."<sup>1</sup>

### 2. SEFER HAHAGU

The Zakodite fragments edited by Schechter (1910) and recently published in facsimile by Zeitlin (1952) make reference (XIII, 2, and XIV, 7-8, the latter being a mutilated text) to ספר ההגו, a sound knowledge of which is an indispensable qualification in candidates for the priesthood. There is no need to leave the term הגו untranslated, as is commonly done after Schechter's example, or to resort, with Dupont-Sommer (*Nouveaux Aperçus* [1953], 88, n. 9), to a Greek derivation. The word is a Hebrew *qatl* form from the root *h g w*, of the same type as Biblical *s'ahu*. Its relation to

<sup>1</sup> See on the translation of *moreh hassedeq*, as "the True Teacher," J. L. TEICHER, *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites*, in *JJS*, II (1951), p. 97.

the Biblical form *hegeh* is problematic (cf. Bauer-Leander: *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache* I [1922], § 72 q'), but in meaning the two are quite distinct. The verb *hagah* is used in the Psalms (e.g., i, 2; xxxiv, 32; xxxvi, 32; lxx, 24; lxxvi, 12; cxlii, 5) and elsewhere (e.g., Jo. i, 8; Prv. viii, 7; xv, 30; b Sira vi, 37) of study and meditation on scriptural and kindred topics; the Greek regularly renders it by *meletaō*. So Genesis Rabba 49 uses the verb for the discussion of the Law in foreign tongues, and Deuteronomy Rabba 11 for the study of the Law as opposed to its performance. In the Mishnah it occurs but thrice and never refers to formal study of the Law, whence it would almost appear as if the literature of normative Judaism avoided the term. Whether this be so or not, it is justifiable to regard *hagu* as the type of study and exegesis characteristic of the Zadokite sectaries and to translate the title of their authoritative work as "the book of exposition, study, interpretation."

A. M. HONEYMAN.

St. Andrews.

## 2. DOCUMENTS OF THE BAR-KOCHBA PERIOD

Documents relating to the Bar-Kochba period were found during the exploration of the caves in Wady Muraba'at, near the Dead Sea (see *Revue Biblique*, 1953, pp. 245ff.). Two of these documents, which are written on papyrus, have been published recently in photograph (R.B., 1953, pp. 273 and 288) and in facsimile (Biblica, 1953, p. 420). They have been transcribed, translated, and commented upon by de Vaux and Milik in *Rev. Bibl.*, 1953, pp. 269-275 and 276-294, respectively. There is room, however, for a different transcription, translation, and interpretation of the texts.

### a. LETTER OF THE NOTABLES OF BETH MASKHO TO YESHU'A BEN GALGOLA

(1) מן הפרנסין של בית משכו בן ישוע ובן אלעזר (2) לישוע בן בבלגולא רוש המחניה שלום שידע (3) יהי לך שהפרה שיקח יהוסף בן ארצטון מן יעקב (4) בן יהודה שיושב אבית משכו שהי שלו בן כנותי (5) ואף אללי שהנזים קרבים אלנו אני עלתי והפצ (6) והפצתיך על נככה שלא תהי אמור מן בשרין (7) לא עלתי אצלך אהיה שלום וכל בית ישראל (8) ישוע בן אלעזר כתבה (9) אלעזר בן יהוסף כתבה (10) יעקוב בן יהודה על נפשה (11) שאול בן אלעזר עד (12) יהוסף בן יהוסף עד (13) יעקוב בן יהוסף מעיד.

(1) From the Notables of Beth-Maškho,<sup>2</sup> Ben Yeshu'a and Ben 'El'azar (2) to Yeshu'a Ben Galgola,<sup>3</sup> Commander of the

<sup>1</sup> DE VAUX reads בנות. He seems to have taken into account the smudges in the papyrus.

<sup>2</sup> The locality is unknown. It is perhaps *Maschana* on the Arnon, 12 miles east of Medeba, mentioned by EUSEBIUS (*Onom.* Nu. xxi, 19).

<sup>3</sup> From Galgala. Cpr. MILIK (R.B., 1953, 282), who thinks, however, that this is "peu vraisemblable."

Army. Peace. May you know (3) that the cow which Yehosef Ben Ariston will purchase from Ya'aqobh (4) Ben Yehuda, resident in Beth Maskho, belongs to the latter. This is the truth.<sup>1</sup> (5) Moreover, were it not<sup>2</sup> that the Romans are close to us I would have come up [to you]. (6) I have told<sup>3</sup> you this lest you say that (7) I did not come up to you out of contempt.<sup>4</sup> Be in peace, you and the whole house of Israel. (8) Yeshu'a Ben 'El'azar wrote this.<sup>5</sup> (9) 'El'azar Ben Yehosef wrote this. (10) Ya'aqobh Ben Yehuda, on his soul [may peace come].<sup>6</sup> (11) Sha'ul Ben 'El'azar, witness. (12) Yehosef Ben Yehosef, witness. (13) Ya'aqobh Ben Yehosef testifies.

The document apparently has two purposes. One is to testify to the right ownership of the cow which Yehosef Ben Ariston will purchase from Ya'aqobh Ben Yehuda. The reason for the writing of the document is best understood if we assume, as suggested by de Vaux, that Yehosef Ben Ariston was a catering officer buying provisions for the army. The owner of the cow was expected to receive the purchase price from the commander himself, to whom the document is addressed. The second purpose is to offer to the commander on behalf of the Notables of Beth Maskho excuses for their failure to visit him and pay their allegiance to him. The Notables plead that it is not "contempt" but the danger from the Roman army that prevented them from doing so.

#### b. ORDER FROM BAR-KOCHBA TO YESHU'A BEN GALGOLA

(1) משמעון בן כוסבה אל ישוע (2) בן גלגולה ולאנשי חברך  
(3) שלונם מעיד אני עלי תשמים (4) יפסנסן<sup>7</sup> מן הגלגלים שהעצלת (5)  
כל אדם שאני נתן הכבלים (6) ברגלכם כמה שעסתנין (7) לבן עפלול  
(8) [ש]מעון [בן כוסבה נשיא ישראל].<sup>8</sup>

(1) From Shim'on Ben Koseba to Yeshu'a (2) Ben Galgola and the members of your staff. (3) Peace. I call upon the heavens

<sup>1</sup> DE VAUX translates: "au su de tous," in accordance with his reading *min binoth*. But this is scarcely Hebrew. The phrase is, I submit, *ken kenuth*, a legal formula similar to *sharir weqayyam* in later documents.

<sup>2</sup> DE VAUX points 'lly as the biblical 'alelay, with the meaning of "alas." This brings him into difficulty. See his statement: "à partir de cette ligne [5], la traduction est moins assurée" (*R.B.*, 1953, p. 272). The word should be pointed 'iluley, with the meaning of "were it not."

<sup>3</sup> הפצח — *hif'il* of *psh*, "to open." The *hif'il* form is, I suggest, equivalent to "*psh peh*," "to speak, to utter."

<sup>4</sup> בשרין, Point *baserin* or *bozerin*, a noun in plural from the root *bsr*, "to despise." The plural form is that found in *rahamim*. Cpr. also the Aramaic *busran*. For the preposition *min* with the meaning of "cause, reason," cpr. Is. xlviii, 4. DE VAUX's rendering of the passage: "Étant donné que tu ne dis que de bonnes nouvelles" is contrary to the Hebrew idiom.

<sup>5</sup> In the sense, not that the signatory actually wrote the document, but that he was responsible for its contents.

<sup>6</sup> על נפשה, DE VAUX: "pour lui-même." This is possible, but the sense is not clear. I suggest that the phrase is an abbreviated eulogistic formula used for the deceased. The full formula may have been: על נפשה ירא שלום

<sup>7</sup> MILIK reads פסנסן, but the meaning of this verb does not fit the context.

<sup>8</sup> The missing words in this line have been supplied by MILIK from another Bar-Kochba letter as yet unpublished.



to witness: (4) Let every man keep apart<sup>1</sup> from the Galileans whom you rescued. (5) Otherwise I will put irons (6) on your feet as I did (7) to Ben 'Aflul. (8) Shim'on Ben Koseba, the Prince of Israel.

The document is a peremptory order from Bar-Kochba to Yeshu'a, commander of the army in the field, that there should be no contact between the army and the Galileans (that is, the Christians—as correctly explained by Milik) whom Yeshu'a had rescued. Bar-Kochba apparently feared the effects of Christian propaganda on the morale of his army, and perhaps he also intended to exercise pressure on the Christians to join his movement. This conforms with the information contained in patristic sources (Justin's *Apol.* I, 31, and Eusebius' *Chronic.* II, 168ff., in Schoene's edition, quoted by Milik). Milik's interpretation of the order as containing a reprimand addressed to Yeshu'a and his staff for having protected the Christians is based on a faulty construction of the Hebrew and disagrees with the patristic sources.

More detailed discussion of these most interesting documents must be postponed until all the material is published.

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> דָּדָד in *nif'al* or *qal*. Cpr. *Mish.* 'Oqeshin, I, 8; *Tos.* 'Oq. I, 5. 'MILIK' translation, "si tu ne cesse pas (tes relations) avec les Galiléens que tu as a tous tirés d'affaire," is contrary to the Hebrew syntax. The phrase *kol 'adam* depends on *yifso* or *yipases* in line 4, not on *shehiṣṣalta*.

## CURRENT LITERATURE

**עזרה ועדות:** Three Scrolls from the Judean Desert; The Legacy of a Community, ed. with Vocalisation, Introduction, Notes, and Indices by A. M. HABERMANN. Pp. 167; Jerusalem, 1952. With nine photographs.

Dr. Habermann, the Librarian of the Schocken Institute, is widely known for his many excellent editions of medieval texts with pointing and short commentaries. He has done an inestimable service in this way by putting the treasures of our literature within the reach of the educated layman, as well as by making available books existing hitherto only in scarce and inaccessible publications. Here he has performed the same task for the much-discussed works of the sect which left behind the collection of writings found in 1947 near the Dead Sea: what a heroic task this is will be appreciated by all those who have wrestled with these difficult documents.

The book contains the Midrash on the first two chapters of Habbakuk, the Scroll of Discipline (which H. identifies with the "Foundations of the Covenant" mentioned in the Damascus Scroll) and the Damascus Scroll, or "Zadokite Fragments," a work which was found in the Cairo Geniza in two medieval copies and first edited by Schechter in 1910, and was at once recognised by Professor Sukenik as forming part of the same literature. For good measure, H. adds a short fragment which I. Lévi published from the Geniza in 1913, and lengthy extracts from the "Wars of the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness" and the "Scroll of Thanksgiving" are inserted in the Introduction.

Though all the documents have been published before, the edition is based on careful study of photographs of the original manuscripts, and H. offers many improved readings, as well as some very convincing emendations and restorations. The Hebrew commentary is brief and concerned in about equal proportions with language and with subject matter. It is sufficient for the ordinary reader who is interested in the Scrolls as pieces of Hebrew literature, and will, one hopes, whet the appetite of the select few sufficiently to make them turn to the more detailed works of Dr. Habermann's predecessors. The principal part of the commentary is contained in the pointing. The editor admits that the writers of the scroll may have used a different pronunciation; this is indeed very likely, since the centuries between 70 C.E. and 800 C.E. saw some far-reaching changes in the phonetic structure of Hebrew, and the vowel-letters inserted in the MSS. often indicate a vocalisation different from our own. What the editor has done is the same as the method adopted by an editor who modernises Shakespeare's spelling or translates Chaucer into modern English. In both cases intelligibility is increased with a minimum of apparatus, as long as it is clearly understood that what is given is a commentary or translation. In cases where various interpretations are possible, different pointings have to be offered; this Habermann has usually done, though not always. The present reviewer feels, however, that it would have been much clearer, and no less scholarly, to modify the spelling also, by omitting the vowel-letters (in doubtful cases the MS. form might have been given in the notes), instead of presenting

a hybrid double vocalisation (by points and superfluous vowel-letters). This would have been no more than what the copyist of the Damascus Scroll did, who often shows by his supralinear pointings what vowel-letters he found in his model, and had no hesitation in modernising the archaic spellings—sometimes wrongly.

In a few cases emended readings have got into the text instead of the notes, and on some occasions the editor omits to mention the fact. The pointing is correct and judiciously applied. There are extensive indices, especially a useful one of important words and phrases which should be of great benefit to all those working on the Scrolls, although there are some disturbing omissions. The bibliography is most valuable in collecting the many contributions which have appeared in Hebrew in periodicals and the daily press, but it is incomplete as far as works in foreign languages are concerned. Especially the part dealing with the Damascus Scroll omits some essential contributions, particularly the more recent ones.

The Introduction is informative and gives some impression of the complexity of the problems. On the vexed question of authorship and date, Habermann pronounces with caution, ascribing the scrolls to a sect close to the Essenes and dating them "not later than 150 years before the destruction of the Second Temple." He thus appears to align himself with the group represented mainly by Professor M. Z. Segal and Professor Dupont-Sommer, who see in the scrolls echoes of the party struggles of late Hasmonean days, preceding the advent of Roman rule.

The criticisms of details advanced here should not be allowed to obscure the fact that Dr. Habermann has done a diffi-

cult job extremely well and put all students of Hebrew literature under a debt. The book is beautifully printed. The present reviewer notes with special satisfaction the use of a sans-serif type of Roman character which blends with the Hebrew type instead of clashing where the two are interspersed.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

---

V. MAAG: *Text, Wortschatz und Begriffswelt des Buches Amos*. (E. J. Brill, Leiden.) 1951. Pp. 254. Price: 40 Gld.

This work consists of four main parts. In the first (pp. 1-62) is offered the Hebrew text of the book of Amos, presented in such a way as to indicate the author's views as to what is authentic and what is secondary. The sections of the Hebrew text are followed by textual notes, translation, and brief discussions of the contents and authenticity of the sections and other matters. The second main part of the work (pp. 63-114) is devoted to a complete vocabulary of the book with an appendix on the prepositions, conjunctions, and particles which occur in the passages judged to be authentic. The third part (pp. 115-207) is given over to a study of individual Hebrew words. In the fourth part (pp. 208-252) are brought together groups of words—words relating to time, place, the world, farming, trade, buildings, war and so on, and the views of the prophet on history, the cult, justice and the social order. YHWH, and eschatology are discussed.

Like most scholars, the author regards ii. 4f, iv. 13, v. 8f and ix. 5f as secondary. Other disputed passages, notably i. 9-12 and ix. 11,



13-15, are, however, retained for the prophet. While the author draws heavily on the standard commentaries for the establishment of the Hebrew text, he occasionally goes his own way—e.g., for **כרצים** in iv. 3 he reads **רפתים**, as in Hab. iii. 17 (p. 19); and for **האלה** in vi. 2 he reads **אלהים** (p. 37). His translation frequently reveals his acquaintance with recent philological research, as, for example, when he gives to **אבל** in i. 2 the meaning "be dry," as suggested by G. R. Driver (pp. 3, 64, 117), and to **בשם** in v. 11 the meaning "exact rent," as proposed by Torczyner (pp. 30, 70). His debt to L. Koehler in this, and in other respects, is everywhere evident, and is freely acknowledged. He has, however, his own contribution to make to a better understanding of Hebrew words, as may be seen, for example, in his interesting discussion of **מסרה** in vi. 10—a term which, he thinks, designates some relation of the dead man (p. 164ff)—and of the word **נערה** in ii. 7, which means, according to him, not "harlot," but "housemaid" (p. 174ff).

Brief reference may be made to some points of general interest. The author sees no relationship between Amos and the documents J and E. There were available to the prophet ancient traditions which never took on literary form. Thus may be explained, for example, v. 25, which is historically inaccurate, but which reflects an old tradition, more vividly remembered in the south than in the north, and which may be said to be correct in so far as the offerings presented in the wilderness were not those which were of central importance in the Canaanite cult (p. 220ff). Amos shared much of the popular thought concerning YHWH, as may be seen, for example, in the creation mythology in vii. 4 and

ix. 3. His clear comprehension of the ethical motive behind YHWH's actions, however, set him over against his contemporaries. It led him, for example, to oppose the official cult (p. 225ff); to a new conception of YHWH's leadership in war—YHWH's wars could no longer be held to be always waged in the interests of Israel (p. 239ff); and to a fresh eschatological outlook—Israel herself must suffer, though there is hope yet for the people (p. 246ff). In Amos may be found the presuppositions of an eventual universalism (p. 244). And—a point of unusual interest—he reveals a special awareness of the responsibility of women in society (iv. 1ff; p. 231).

For the author's view that a survey of the vocabulary of the O.T. writers and of their use of words, combined with thorough lexicographical investigation, is an essential preliminary to exegesis, there can be nothing but the warmest approval. And in having undertaken this preliminary task he has performed a valuable service. There is, as is to be expected in a work of this kind, large scope for differences of opinion. It may be thought, for example, that the astral import of v. 26, which is eliminated by the adoption of the readings **סכת** "booth" and **כיון** "base" (pp. 36, 157), has more to be said for it than the author allows (see E. A. Speiser's recent remarks in *Bull. of the Amer. Schools of Or. Research*, No. 108, 1947, p. 5f). Again the suggestion that **שמרה** in i. 11 is to be explained by reference to the Accadian *shamaru* "rage"—the credit for which belongs to G. R. Driver and not, as the author seems to think, to the reviewer—is rejected on the ground that a very striking change of subject would have to be supposed in the same verse. No change of subject,

however, need be supposed if אפו here is taken as the subject of ויטרף. The author adopts the reading ויטרף "and he kept" for ויטרף, the subject being Edom (p. 203f). In view of the phrase אפו טרף in Job xvi. 9, however, it may be doubted whether such an emendation, widely current though it is, is necessary. The verse can accordingly be translated quite satisfactorily as it stands—"and his anger tore perpetually and his wrath raged for ever." Occasionally, too, a question arises in the mind of the reader. Why, for example, does the author say that מרבק in vi. 4 means, in a collective sense, "das zur Mast gehaltene Vieh" (p. 86), when he is quite aware that מרבק means only "stall" (pp. 38, 167f)? Criticisms such as these do not, however, seriously affect the good impression which the book makes. Even where he covers familiar ground the author introduces into his work a welcome note of fresh-

ness. The book will be very useful to students, and scholars will find much in it that will repay study.

A list of *corrigenda* is supplied at the end of the book, but it is by no means complete. In case the book goes into a second edition the following errors may be recorded—p. 77, יד is an error for יד; p. 80, ירושלם for ירושלם; p. 90 'ebrah for 'ebhrah; p. 97 rābhāh for rabāh; p. 116, Trankdarbringnng for Trankdarbringung; p. 123, ארז for ארז; p. 129, Papyry for Papyri; p. 142, יהוה for יהוה; p. 144, חלק for חלק; p. 147, Bandissin for Baudissin; p. 186, פקע for פקד; p. 203, GA for G.A., Noth-Semitic for North-Semitic, Oxford for Oxford, and שמרה for שמרה; p. 253, הבשן for הבשו; p. 254, תנתא for תנתא.

D. WINTON THOMAS  
Cambridge.